DOCTRINE OF THE PRIESTHOOD

Let virtue garnish thy thoughts unceasingly; then shall thy confidence wax strong in the presence of God; and the doctrine of the priesthood shall distil upon thy soul as the dews from heaven. (D & C 121:45)

FEBRUARY 1987 Hanna, UTAH VOL. 4 No. 2

THE POLITICAL PLATFORM

OF

THE MANIFESTO

Collier's P\ublishing Co.

Copyright © February 1987
by
Fred C. Collier

All Rights Reserved

2rd Edition
Aug 2012

ISBN 0-934964-49-1
Copies may be Obtained
By Writing:

Colliers Publishing Co.
HC 63 Box 1B
Hanna, Ut. 84031

or call:

Phone: (801) 305-3227
E-mail: fcollier@collierspublishingco.com
Web Site: http://www.collierspublishingco.com
Web Site: http://www.churchofthefirstborn.us.com

Forward

The following pages contain a series of six letters — five written by President John Taylor and one by Charles W. Penrose. Penrose argues in what would appear to be flawless logic for all the advantages of concession, and in graphic terms he describes the horrors to come upon the Church, should they refuse to bend to the will of their enemies. He then points out the possibility of different interpretations or constructions which might be placed upon a carefully worded anti-"Bigamy" or "Polygamy Law" which would in effect nullify such a law once Utah became a state, making it possible to legally practice "Celestial" or plural marriage. His whole argument very positively sets forth the political strategy for what ultimately became the manifesto of 1890.

President Taylor's letters clearly display an uncompromising zeal for Principle and manifest the tremendous pressure which was constantly being exerted upon him by other leading men in the Church, who continually pushed for compromise. Most of President Taylor's letters are co-signed by George Q. Cannon, his first counselor, but other evidence would argue that secretly, Cannon was sympathetic with those who wanted concession.

In his letters, President Taylor issues a Prophetic warning of what the future would hold in store for the Saints, should the demands of concession be met. It is only sad that the telling story of history vindicates the accuracy of his vision.

Following this there is an appendix containing other statements which were made by different General Authorities regarding the Manifesto.

Table of Contents

p. 1 Letter of President John Taylor, addressed to William Paxman, President of the New Zealand Mission — dated 4 February 1887

p. 4 Letter of Charles W. Penrose, addressed to President John Taylor — dated 16 February 1887

p. 12 Letter of President John Taylor, addressed to Charles W. Penrose and Franklin S. Richards, — dated 19 February 1887

p. 16 Letter of President John Taylor, addressed to Grover Cleveland, President of the United States — written (probably) in the latter part of February 1887

p. 18 Letter of President John Taylor, addressed to Franklin S. Richards — dated 2 May 1887

p. 19 Letter of President John Taylor, addressed to John sharp — dated 2 May 1887

THE POLITICAL PLATFORM

OF

THE MANIFESTO

Edited
by
Fred C. Collier

A letter written by President John Taylor to William Paxman, dated February 4, 1887.

After discussing letters received from President Paxman concerning problems among the Maories in New Zealand, President Taylor wrote the following:

You have probably heard before this of the passage of the Edmunds Tucker Bill through the House of Representatives on the 12th of last month, when, with the marked assistance of speaker Carlyle, it was rushed through with a hoop and a yell under the gag rule of the previous question. It would appear from the action of the House on this occasion that nothing is too infamous, too tyrantical or absurd for that body to pass if it be aimed against the

Church of God; and the feeling with many evidently is, they will go to any length in their efforts to destroy the Latter Day Saints and rob them of their rights, their liberties and their possessions. The pretext of polygamy is now relegated to the background and the full measure of their infamous intentions is permitted to come to the front. Nothing short of our political destruction, wholesale robbery and spoilation will satisfy them. But, as the old adage truthfully says, man proposes but God disposes; so will they find that the end is not yet, the problem is not solved and the fruits of their labors will be as unsatisfying as the apples of the dead sea as the Prophets of old declared, they will assuredly be a hungry man who sleepeth and dreameth that he eateth, but he awakeneth and his soul is empty — so will it be, not only with them but with all who fight against Mount Zion; for, as we have often said, God will fight against them, and woe and misery will be their portion.

Since the passage of the Edmunds Tucker Bill by the House, there has been considerable talk, both here and Washington, of the possibility of our forming a State Constitution in which "Polygamy and Bigamy" would be forever prohibited; some persons contending that we could do this without violating our consciences or acting in bad faith toward the government and people of the United States; and such a provision need not necessarily interfere with our belief in and practice of Celestial Marriage under the state government. We cannot frame a constitution ourselves of this character; for it will not do for us, after enduring what we have for the sake of our religion and its principles, to put ourselves in a position where our words and actions my be construed into a surrender of that for which we have ever contended. Better for us to continue to suffer from the attacks of our enemies and their persecutions than for us to occupy a position which we cannot honorably, openly and successfully defend against all attacks that may be made upon us. At this day we cannot afford to put ourselves in an equivocial attitude upon this question or in one that might have the appearance of being false.

We are constantly menaced by our enemies and they are exceeding active in trying to find us. After Marshal Dyer left for Washington, special exertions were made and rewards were offered to get a hold of us. Dixon, McKay and others are not friendly to Dyer and it seems that they are anxious to secure us during his absence so as to injure

him, by making it appear that he does not make proper exertions. Of course, we have to be exceedingly careful but we feel that all our care would be unavailing if the Lord did not protect us. The manner in which we have been preserved considering the amount of correspondence we have, both in writing and by personal communication is marvelous to us. We still trust to our Father to preserve and protect us and to enable us to continue our labors in a manner that shall be acceptable unto Him. The latest telegraphic dispatches from Washington state that the conference committee on the Tucker bill held their first meeting today. All were present except Senator Engles who was sick. The discussion lasted about 5 hours which was mostly consumed by Senator Edmunds in an exposition of his views on the subject. The committee adjourned subject to call. The probabilities of the passage of the bill have apparently not been increased by today's action. With love to yourself and the Elders with you, praying the Lord to bless you in your labors, we remain your brethren,

John Taylor
George Q. Cannon

(The First Presidency letter press copy books, CR 1 2013 Vol. 15:70, Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah)

A letter written by Charles W. Penrose, to President John Taylor, dated February 16, 1887.

I was first made aware of this letter by Henry J. Wolfinger's article on ". . . The Woodruff Manifesto . . ." (Utah Historical Quarterly 39 # 4, 328–350) where short extracts of it were quoted. Following this I spent over three years trying to acquire a complete copy of it. To this end I am indebted to Thomas A. Green, who had the patience to wait more than two days for its whereabouts to be discovered in the archives of the Church Historian's Office:

Salt Lake City,
February 16, 1887
President John Taylor,

Dear Brother:

In the following it is taken for granted that, as intimated in letters to brethren at Washington, it is desirable that Utah should become a State in the Union at as early a date as possible. This seems to be the only real remedy for the troubles that seriously afflict the Territory and harass and menace the Church. Statehood, under the auspices of the majority of the citizens, means deliverance from political bondage, and influence in the councils of the nation. Today Utah is in the United States and part of the body politic, existing on the public domain and subject to all the authority without exercising or taking part in any of the power belonging to the Government of the United States. She is in the country as a vassal. With Statehood she would be in the Union as a factor of the sum of its powers, and with votes to command influence and respect from the rest of the Nation.

The Church is an independent body, distinct from any political organization, whether a Territory or a State. But it is affected materially and necessarily by the political situation. Because the members of the Church are also citizens of the Territory and would be of the State. But while the Church must study its own interests as affected by civil government, it must not ignore the fact that in the United States it must be kept separate and apart from the Territorial or State organization, whatever influence it may exercise over its members in their capacity of citizens. The acts of the people, as citizens of the State or of the Territory, must not be confounded with the acts of the Church as an ecclesiastical body.

Any movement towards Statehood, then, must be made by the body politic, and not by the body ecclesiastical. But it is within the province of the latter to say how far its influence may be used or withheld in regard to the course of its members politically. If all the members of the Church are deprived of participation in the civil government locally, as they are already nationally, the Church will have nothing to do with the State, either directly or indirectly. It will be utterly powerless to shape any policy or protect itself though the medium of the Territory or the State, and will have no voice in political matters for any purpose. That is the position that now stares it in the face. If the bill now pending becomes a law, every person desiring to vote will have to take an oath declaring his marital status and that he will obey the laws of the United States,

and particularly the laws that relate to bigamy, polygamy and unlawful cohabitation, and that he will not teach, aid, or abet or advise anyone in the infraction of those laws. This, it is expected and not without reason, will prevent all true "Mormons" from voting and thus leave the local government entirely in the hands of the enemies of the majority and of the Church. They can then make local laws to still further enslave the majority and cripple the Church, being on the spot and having all the local political power. The atrocities that could be easily perpetrated under color of law need not be pictured. There will be nothing, humanly speaking, to prevent their proceeding to the vilest extremities, except such checks as might be interposed by Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States and it is quite doubtful that anything would be done by those bodies in the way of relief.

But the most serious part of this prospective calamity is the certainty that the anti-"Mormon" population would form the government of the new State seeking a place in the grand federation. Whether as a Republican or a Democratic State it would go in with the strongest kind of a Constitution, not only against bigamy, polygamy and polygamous association, but against plural or celestial marriage and its relations and status, to be afterward backed up with laws enacted by the enemies of the Church against all its institutions and ordinances, as administered by an organization that teaches and advises and countenances marriage relations that are unconstitutional under the State and obnoxious to its laws. The Legislature, The Executive, the Judiciary, all the petty local officers in county, district, precinct, city and ward, would be on the side of the State as against the members of the Church, with unlimited taxing powers and no check from Congress or the Supreme Court of the United States. It would be then, really and truly, a State antagonistic to the Saints, and a Church without any political influence in the State or the nation, because its members would be utterly stripped of all voting powers and of any participation whatever in politics. How the political powers so completely lost could ever be recovered, requires the prophetic gift to discern. Naturally, it looks impossible.

Against all this stands the Possibility of Statehood under the auspices of the majority. This would give the people who of right

should regulate all local concerns, the control of all the powers of State government, legislative, executive and judicial. They would make the laws, define them and execute them. They could do this so as to protect the Church and its institutions and not destroy them. The influence of the Church would prevail in the State, not by dominating it or directly interfering with its operations, but through its members in their civil capacity. It would be "the power behind the throne". The spirit controlling the body; but not the body itself. Under laws enacted, plural or celestial marriage need not be disturbed as a religious institution, so long as it did not seek the sanction of the State as a civil institution, or infringe upon the civil law. The civil laws then must be framed with a view to this distinction, and this would be constitutionality and morally right, because the State, under its own constitution, must not interfere with an establishment of religion, nor forbid the free exercise thereof. The advantages of such a difference need not here be painted out. They are as self evident as they are immense and desirable.

Can this be achieved, and if so, by what means? The prospects we have now are more favorable to this than they are likely to be at any future time in our history. As a Democratic State Utah would be a great temptation to the dominant party. Three electoral votes make the balance of power. Two Senators and a Representative in Congress would be potent for the party and for the new State in case the anti-"Mormon" outcry was still raised. A people with votes are somebody in politics; without them they are nobody.

It may be set down as a fixture, that without some arrangement on the polygamy question, Statehood for Utah is not to be considered. It is outside of all controversy. It could not be undertaken by any party, because the country would not have it and it is not even debatable. Can the people of Utah settle this matter themselves? In a political capacity, yes; as a Church, perhaps no. But it is not properly a Church question, except incidentally as explained above. It is purely before the country a question of politics. The opportunity now afforded is in the initiative taken by the Government, instead of a voluntary offer on the part of the people. The Scott Amendment is the offer to the people on the part of the Government. This failing to pass or be attached to the bill now pending, if the President of the United States will veto the bill, contingent on the willingness

of the people to accept, politically, the proposition, it still comes *to* them, not *from* them. Further, the conditions of Montana's going in as a State contain this same proposition. The State constitution must forbid bigamy and polygamy. The probability is that a general Constitutional Amendment will be adopted which will prevent any State from recognition unless it provides against these offences.

If the people of Utah accept the condition, they but accept the inevitable. For if they do not take advantage of it for self protection, their local enemies will take it and manipulate it to their political destruction. If the majority do not take it and use it to protect the Church, the minority will take it to enslave and harass and cripple the Church and all its institutions.

But can the conditions be accepted, honorably and religiously? It must be kept in mind that this is a political matter. It is not a proposition to the Church. It is a question to the citizens. The plurally married members of the Church, embracing its leaders and most of its influential men, need not give direct answer to the question. The voting citizens, Mormon, Apostate, Gentile and neutral are interested in this. They will have to vote upon it, if it comes to a vote. It is a secular issue. The Church is not asked to give up Celestial marriage, nor to relinquish bigamy or polygamy. The "Mormons" are not asked to concede anything as to their religion or to promise anything for the future. The Territory of Utah, in a civil capacity, is required to accept a plank in its political platform as a condition to its Statehood; a provision prohibiting polygamy and bigamy *by law*. The Territory is already under this prohibition, actually and legally. And it is being enforced by the enemies of the majority. Will they take it under their own manipulation and use it fairly and with a view to saving their religious rights, or will they allow it to remain and be perpetuated in the hands of their enemies, to still further encroach upon those rights? Here is no compromise. Here is no promise. Here is no dishonorable agreement. The Church does not figure in it as between the citizens and the Government, it only stays back and refrains from advising that portion of the citizens who are its members against accepting the proposition.

Supposing the assurance is given that the Church will not interfere with its members on voting on this question in their capacity of citizenship, if the bill now pending is defeated, or in the event of its

passage and signature, that the way shall be opened for their free, untrammeled vote on the Statehood question, and the removal of the disabilities of the older citizens; what will be the consequence? Why that we shall have in our State Constitution a prohibition that already exists in law and fact, and is severely enforced, and our friends will have the enacting of the laws in pursuance thereof. They can enact laws against bigamy and polygamy so as to ignore celestial marriage without doing so in terms. Marriage *under the State* (not under the Church, which makes its own marriage regulations) will be a civil contract embracing certain conditions. The avoidance or non-fulfilment of any of those conditions will render the contract void in law. It may be perfectly acceptable to the Lord and His Church. But it will not be a marriage in law. A second or third union of this kind would not be bigamy or polygamy, because the civil law would not be broken that forbids bigamy and polygamy and defines them as offences against the civil law of marriage. The matter is simple, clearly defined, practicable and in no way dishonorable, unless our plural marriages which are now unrecognizable by the civil law may be termed dishonorable. The status would be the same in both instances, only what we do now is punishable, and what we should do then would be beyond the reach of the civil law, being purely ecclesiastical.

But waiving this, let us look at the matter from the standpoint of the State as against the Church. If we view the terms bigamy and polygamy to mean our celestial marriage relations and forbid them by law, what then? Why we simply lay ourselves liable to prosecution under the laws enacted by our friends, administered by our friends, tried by our friends, adjudicated upon by our friends, instead of having all this done by our enemies. We then say, we consider the law God superior to the law of the State, and if we have to break the law of the State to keep the law of God, we will stand by the consequences. But we have our friends to adjudge us guilty and meet out the penalties which will have a minimum as well as a maximum limit, while now it is all maximum and no minimum in practice. That is all perfectly fair and above board, without mental reservation or quibble, or any fine-drawn distinctions as to the difference between plural marriage and bigamy, or celestial marriage and polygamy, and those who pleased to do so could class them all together.

Under the last considerations, the people in a political capacity could conscientiously, fairly, honorably and prudently accept the situation on the ground that bigamy and polygamy being obnoxious to the nation, the will of the majority is accepted as a matter of civil polity, but not in any way as a concession of principle, or a compromise of religion, or a yielding up of a tenet or practice of faith. The State accepts the inevitable on the democratic rule of the majority, the Church stands where it has always stood, and those of its members who violate the civil law in order to keep the law of God, are ready to meet the consequences under the laws of the State, without flinching and without equivocation.

So, whether we make our definitions of bigamy and polygamy to exclude plural marriage, or as comprehending that practice, our monogamous friends can conscientiously and consistently adopt the prohibition in their capacity as citizens forming a secular commonwealth. And the Church simply says to its members, "You are free to vote on this question according to your best judgement, the Church will not forbid you nor cast you out for your action on this civil matter." And with this view of the position, cannot the leading men of the Church say in answer to the question now pressing for a reply: "The people will be left free to vote on that question, with a fair prospect of success; it is a political issue and the Church will not interfere."

The bill has been so modified that the President will have great difficulty to find grounds for a veto. Nothing occurs in the test oath as to *belief*. The three year's penalty for adultery is to catch polygamists alone, but he could not point out or object to that. The winding up of the Church and P[erpetual] E[migration] Fund affairs looks plausible on principles of law and equity, and the cutting down of the appointing power to the Probate Judges, robs the bill of the chief features on which he could safely predict a veto. He will have to be stiffened by some assurance, or will in all probability sign it. The test oath appears to be cunningly kept within constitutional limits and yet made exclusive of "Mormons" who will not promise to keep all the laws.

If the members of the Church who would vote on the Constitution question were quietly informed as to its effects and given to understand it as a political and not a Church question, and that it would not interfere with their standing as Latter-day Saints, it

would soon be comprehended in its true light. So far from being a subterfuge, it would relieve our people from the endless subterfuges and prevarications which our present condition imposes, and which threaten to make our rising generation a race of deceivers.

Summary

This is a political issue. It concerns *all* classes of citizens. Utah will go into the Union with a constitutional provision against polygamy. It will either be enforced by our enemies, or manipulated by our friends. In either case the Church will cut no public figure. The "Mormons" are not asked to compromise, to give up anything, or to promise anything. The question is, will the majority of the citizens of Utah adopt the prohibitory clause, or let their enemies adopt it and enlarge upon it? The leaders of the Church are simply asked, will you leave your people free in their capacity as citizens to form a State Government in harmony with the rest of the Union on the main question, or will you prevent them? The crisis is at hand. The new State will be non-polygamous by civil law. Shall we shelter our ecclesiastical law and institutions, or shall we leave them to be preyed upon by our enemies? When the answer is finally given, every true Latter-day Saint will accept the issue. Very Respectfully,

Your Brethren in the Gospel

Charles W. Penrose
Franklin S. Richards

(Charles W. Penrose Papers, Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah)

A letter written by President John Taylor to Charles W. Penrose and Franklin S. Richards:

February 19th, 1887

Elder C[harles] W. Penrose and F[ranklin] S. Richards,

Dear Brethren:

Your letter of the 16th inst. written in response to our request for you to give to us in writing the views which you had orally communicated to us, has been received, and been carefully considered.

You have made a very able, clear and comprehensive presentation of the case from your standpoint. If the premises from which you reason were correct, we should almost be inclined to say that your communication was conclusive upon the subject. In most forceful language you describe the evils with which we are menaced, and which are likely to come upon us under the operation of the Tucker bill should it become law, and be almost irrevocably fastened upon us, unless we adopt this plan which is now being urged by our friends, namely, that of framing and voting for a constitution which shall forever prohibit the practice of bigamy and polygamy in the new State.

The evils which you describe as impending are of such a nature as to impel one to ask for any method of deliverance which would not be dishonorable. The arguments you use in favor of the adoption of such a Constitution are very plausible. But we are confronted at the very outset by this inquiry: What good grounds are there for supposing that, if we were to adopt such a Constitution, and present it to Congress, and ask to be admitted under it into the Union as a State, our request would be favorably considered? Nothing that we have heard from President Cleveland gives us warrant to believe that he would be satisfied upon this point by such an instrument.

We know that Mr. Curtis has written hopefully in this direction; but his hopes appear to have for their chief basis his desires and anxiety to see us delivered from the dreadful consequences of the Tucker bill.

A letter just received from Brother John W. Young, giving a description of the interview with President Cleveland, does not furnish ground for believing that such a concession as you suggest would be all that he would ask. You must bear constantly in mind the fact that President Cleveland has been anxious to settle the question; but the basis of settlement in his mind, as presented by Dr. Miller when he came here, was the future discontinuance of plural marriages.

We have just received a report containing brief interviews with nearly every Member of the House of Representatives. They have

been seen individually, and their views are written in their own language upon the Tucker bill and the Scott amendment. The members who have not expressed themselves is less than half a dozen. From these interviews it is plain that 19 out of 20 have no confidence in the Scott amendment, and would not have voted for it, because they looked upon it as a subterfuge, or as being in the interest of the Mormons and to nullify the Tucker bill. The majority express themselves as having no confidence in our promising to do what the Scott amendment purposes to do, and they would not consent to the admission of the Territory as a State on any such terms; that nothing short of the complete extirpation of polygamy by harsh measures, such as the Tucker bill, would satisfy them.

It appears clear, therefore, to our minds, that the adoption of such a policy as you outline in your communication would not satisfy Congress and the country at large, and its adoption by us would only result in humiliation to us without any corresponding benefit.

For years before President Young's death, the First Presidency of the Church assumed an attitude upon this question which has not been changed by the First Presidency up to the present time. That attitude has been both dignified and consistent with our professions and belief. We have not acquitted with this question, have shown no inclination to compromise with principle, or in any manner wavered in our maintenance of our rights connected with it. Every well informed public man knows this; and they are conscious that this principle is so deeply imbedded in our belief and practice that nothing but the most cruel and far-reaching measures will cause us to abandon it. Their expressions show that they would have no confidence that such language as is used in the Scott amendment would bind us to a renunciation of this practice. If we were to make such a proposal, we should lower the ground upon which we had so long stood, and so consistently maintained, and take new ground. In doing so, we should have the mortification of proposing a concession that would be spurned and thrown back at us with contempt. We should, thereby, not only lose our own self-respect, but our own people would be weakened, and the world would say we offered to barter away principle for the sake of expediency.

If the plan which you suggest would be accepted by the nation, and could be successfully carried out in the manner which appears

to you feasible, the question would then present itself in a very different light to what it does now to our minds. It is as clear to us as light that this is not practicable, and that it is a plan which, under present circumstances, we cannot possibly accept. Whatever the evils and terrors of the Tucker bill may be, personally we prefer to endure them than to take this other course. We have put our trust in God in the past, and we must trust Him in this as in all other things in the future. In doing so we are not troubled with even the shadow of a doubt as to what the result will be.

What changes have been made in the Tucker bill and in the test oath?

With kind regards, and thanking you for the interest you have taken and the trouble you have been at to get your views clearly before us, and properly recognizing the motives which have prompted you in your communications,

We remain Your Brethren

John Taylor
George Q. Cannon

(John Taylor Papers, Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah; see also John Taylor Papers, Special Collections, University of Utah Library)

The following is a description, accompanied with excerpts, of a correspondence between Grover Cleveland, who was then President of the United States, and President John Taylor. It is taken from the diary of John M. Whitaker, who saw President Taylor's letter as it passed through the Historical Department of the Church on its way out in the mail, on February 28th, 1887. I have made a search for both letters in the Grover Cleveland Papers, but unfortunately, they are not there:

The President of the United States had personally written a long letter to President John Taylor of the Church and his people, in

which he pleads for the President and Saints to lay aside polygamy and "COME AND BE LIKE US" and all the past will be forgiven, etc. President John Taylor in his masterly way (as only he was able to do because of the sufferings he and his people had suffered in the past) replied in an historic document, tracing the persecutions through which the Prophet Joseph Smith and the Saints had past, from the time he espoused the cause of the Great Latter Day work, and became such a staunch friend, supporter and defender of the Prophet and his Work of Wonder, etc. He thanked the President of the United States, Grover Cleveland, and recited how he himself with the Prophet and other Church leaders had made visits to the authorities at Washington, including . . . past presidents of the United States, to the Senate, to the House of Representatives, to the judicial authorities and to all others who had the power to make relief measured, etc., "and, Sir, the only reply we have received was from the then President," *"Gentlemen, your cause is just but we can do nothing for you."* Then in his masterly and magnificent reply, among many stinging facts and statements, finished by saying:

> Mr. President, — you ask us to come and be like you? What have you to offer? You promise us Liberty, as a price for giving up what we believe to be true and is sacred to us! NO, NEVER! When we get our liberty and freedom, it will not be purchased at the sacrifice and price you offer. God has protected us in the past and we confidently expect that He will do so in the future. Whatever the evils and terrors of the Edmunds-Tucker Bill may be, *personally* we prefer to endure them, than to take this other course. We have put our trust in God in the past, and we trust Him in this as in all other things in the future. In doing so, we are not troubled with even the shadow of a doubt as to what the results will be. . . . . .
>
> We Remain,
>
> Your Brethren
>
> John Taylor
> George Q. Cannon

This Letter to the President of the United States was a carefully documented, historical [masterpiece — it was] wonderfully written. With great painstaking . . . [effort President Taylor presented] our side of the controversy with the world and [especially as it pertained to] the United States, versus The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day

Saints — but particularly against the leaders of this nation and its people, leaving them without the least excuse for the extensive, bitter and wicked persecutions of the past and present, going on against the Church and its people. How proud we all feel to have such courageous, honest and worthy leaders, lovable men, as we now have, and how the Saints and many good men in the world also, pray for their health, happiness and protection. *(Diary of John M. Whitaker, February 28th, 1887, p. 83– 84, Special Collections, University of Utah Library)*

A letter witten by President John Taylor to Franklin S. Richards:

May 2nd, 1887

[Franklin] S. Richards, Esq.

Dear Brother:

Your letter of the 30th enclosing letter from Brother C. W. Nibley has been received, and his letter has been perused.

It is quite interesting and it is pleasing to know that the brethren are so active in looking after our interest. We return it herewith.

The statement of the interview between Brothers Sharp, Smith, yourself and the two Commissioners, has also been read and considered. Any good feelings they can manifest towards us we appreciate; but when they talk about our Doctrine and practice of plural marriage, they touch a subject upon which they are blindly ignorant, and their suggestions and recommendations, if accepted by us, would only have the effect to destroy us, and bring upon us more terrible evils than they depicted to you as likely to come upon us if we persist in our course, or than their imaginations can conceive. It is very well to talk glibly about compromising and arranging for dispensing with polygamy, as they call it, but they know nothing of the tremendous consequences that would befall us as a people, or as individuals, if we should follow their suggestions, or allow sympathy, or acquiescence with their views, to have place in our hearts.

Your Brother,

John Taylor

(John Taylor Papers, Special Collection, University of Utah Library; see also John Taylor Papers, Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah)

A letter written by President John Taylor to John Sharp:

May 2nd, 1887

Hon. John Sharp
[S. L.] City

Dear Brother:

We are in receipt of your Communication of the 29th describing a visit which you and Brother E. A. Smith and Richards have had with Messrs. Carlton and McClernand of the Utah Commission.

We are much obliged to you for this communication, and are pleased to learn from you of the kind and sympathetic feeling which they exhibited in our behalf; while we know their advice upon questions involving our religion and the proper method of living it is unwise, and utterly out of our power to adopt, while Latter-day Saints; still we can appreciate the motives which prompt them to give it. They can foresee the danger we are in from the plots and machinations of the Loyal League. Political experience teaches them what the results to us will be if our enemies should be successful. But they cannot measure its tremendous consequences which would follow to us if we offended our God by Repudiating the Commands He has given us.

With kind regards,
Your Brother,

John Taylor

(John Taylor Papers, Special Collections, University of Utah Library; see also John Taylor Papers, Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah)

APPENDIX

August 19th, 1866
President Brigham Young

Now, we as Christians desire to be saved in the kingdom of God. We desire to attain to the possession of all the blessings there are for the most faithful man or people that ever lived upon the face of the earth, even him who is said to be the father of the faithful, Abraham of old. We wish to obtain all that father Abraham obtained. I wish here to say to the Elders of Israel, and to all the members of this Church and kingdom, that it is in the hearts of many of them to wish that the doctrine of polygamy was not taught and practiced by us. It may be hard for many, and especially for the ladies, yet it is no harder for them than it is for the gentlemen. It is the word of the Lord, and I wish to say to you, and all the world, that if you desire with all your hearts to obtain the blessings which Abraham obtained, you will be polygamists at least in your faith, or you will come short of enjoying the salvation and the glory which Abraham has obtained. This is as true as that God lives. You who wish that there were no such thing in existence, if you have in your hearts to say: "We will pass along in the Church without obeying or submitting to it in our faith or believing this order, because, for aught that we know, this community may be broken up yet, and we may have lucrative offices offered to us; we will not, therefore, be polygamists lest we should fail in obtaining some earthly honor, character and office, etc," — the man that has that in his heart, and will continue to persist in pursuing that policy, will come short of dwelling in the presence of the Father and the Son, in celestial glory. The only men who become Gods, even the Sons of God, are those who enter into polygamy. Others attain unto a glory and may even be permitted to come into the presence of the Father and the Son; but they cannot reign as kings in glory, because they had blessings offered unto them, and they refused to accept them.

The Lord gave a revelation through Joseph Smith, his servant; and we have believed and practiced it. Now, then, it is said that this must be done away before we are permitted to receive our place as a State in the Union. . . . . I heard the revelation on polygamy,

and I believed it with all my heart, and I know it is from God — I know that He revealed it from heaven; I know that it is true, and understand the bearings of it and why it is. "Do you think that we shall ever be admitted as a State into the Union without denying the principle of polygamy?" If we are not admitted until then, we shall never be admitted. (*JD*11:268–69)

EPISTLE OF ELDER WILFORD WOODRUFF
ONE OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES

To the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,
and
To All The World, Greeting

An Epistle of Wilford Woodruff, President of the Quorum of the Twelve, written at Santa Clara Settlement, Utah, on the 22nd and 23rd of February 1879. This Epistle was written 15 days after Woodruff had gone into hiding, a move which became necessary in order for him to avoid Arrest and Imprisonment for the Practice of Plural Marriage. Shortly after its writing a copy of Woodruff's Epistle was sent to President John Taylor for his approval, and after making two Doctrinal Corrections and minor edditing, 5 weeks later it was published by the Deseret News *on 1 April 1879; and then again 20 days later in the* Millennial Star *Vol 41: <21 April 1879> 241–246)*

For more information regarding the Historical Setting and Context of this Epistle, see the statement by the Editor, together with extracts of Woodruff's diary entries, both of which immediately follow the Epistle.

¶ I feel desirous to once more, while in the flesh, by the word of God and Testimony of Jesus Christ, to bear my testimony unto you, as the Church and Kingdom of God, Established on the Earth by the God of Heaven in this last Dispensation and Fullness of Times. I also wish to bear my Testimony to all Nations under heaven,

Emperors, Kings, Presidents, Statesmen, Governors, Judges, all Rulers, and the Ruled, [both] Jew and Gentile, who dwell upon the face of the whole Earth.

¶ My Testimony is this unto all Men and Nations, that you live in the day and hour of the Judgments of God Almighty. You live in the day and generation when the God of Israel has set his hand to perform his Work, his strange Work in the Latter Days. You live in the age in which God will bring to pass the fulfillment of that flood of Prophecy and Revelation which has been spoken [of] by all the Prophets since the World began — which stands recorded in the Sacred Books of Divine Truth. The fulfillment of these Revelations will involve the Destiny of the whole world, Jew and Gentile, Rich and poor, High and low, Saint and sinner, Babylon and Zion. Therefore prepare yourselves, O ye inhabitants of the Earth, for the hour of God's Judgment is at the door. As it was in the days of Noah and Lot, so shall it be in the day of the Coming of the Son of Man.

¶ I address myself first to the Saints of God, who have Entered into Covenant with the Lord, and [who] have been Ordained unto the Holy Priesthood: If you are living your religion, and Enjoying the Spirit of Inspiration, which is your Duty, you know as God lives that Joseph Smith was a Prophet of God, that he received the Administration of Angels, that he brought forth the Book of Mormon, and translated it By the power of God. You know he received the Fullness of the Everlasting Gospel, and the Holy Priesthood and Apostleship, and the Keys thereof, and that he organized the Church of Christ, "the only True and Living Church upon the face of the whole Earth," with [all] its gifts and graces, [and which is the only Church] with which the Lord is "well pleased."

¶ [Again, if you are living your religion, and Enjoying the Spirit of Inspiration] you also know [that] Joseph Smith the Prophet, left his Testimony upon the Earth, and sealed that Testimony with his own Life and Blood, and that [that] Testament is in force "upon all the world". [You also know that] ~~And~~ that Testament is filled with the Revelations of God, ~~that~~ [many of which] Stand upon its pages like Flames of Living Fire, ready to be fulfilled upon all the inhabitants of the Earth.

¶ In this Testament the Lord has Commanded his servants to go into all the world and Preach this Gospel of the Kingdom to Every

Creature, as far as doors can be opened. He has also Commanded His servants to visit New York, Albany & Boston, and all the Notable Cities and Villages of the world, reproving them of their ungodly deeds, and warning them of the Desolation and utter Abolishment which await them, if they reject the servants of God or their testimony. "For with you, saith the Lord Almighty, I will rend their Kingdoms; for I will shake not only the Earth, but the starry Heavens shall tremble; . . . you cannot see it now, but soon you shall see it and know that I am God." (D&C 84:118–119)

¶ You Latter-day Saints, do you not know these things are True? You do, and so do I, for the Spirit of God bears Record, and the Record is Truth, and Truth abideth Forever. Under the circumstances, what manner of men and women ought we to be? Are we prepared, as a people, for the great Events which await us; which await both Zion and Babylon? Judge ye! What is our duty as Saints of the Living God? It is our duty to humble ourselves before the Lord and Call upon his name, until we are filled with the Holy Ghost and the Spirit of Inspiration — [that we might] Walk in the Light of Christ; Pay our Tithes and Offerings, Keep the Commandments of God, have Faith in his Word, Remember and Honor the Ordinances we have Observed, and [keep] the Covenants and Obligations we have entered into in the Holy Places and Temples of our God. We should unite ourselves together in a temporal as well as a spiritual point of view, as directed by the wise men of Israel. We should seek to build up the Kingdom and Zion of our God, and not ourselves alone. When we do these things, then we are prepared as a people to let our prayers ascend into the Ears of the Lord of Sabaoth, from one End of Heaven to the other, and they will be heard and answered upon our heads.

¶ Again, this Testament which Joseph Smith has left, contains a Revelation and Commandment from God, out of Heaven, concerning the Patriarchal Order of Marriage. The Lord has commanded us to have our Wives and Children sealed to us, for Time and Eternity, that we may have them with us in our family organizations in the Resurrection, to dwell with us Forever in the Eternal Worlds, that we may have an increase of posterity forever in connection with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the Ancient Patriarchs. And God, Our Heavenly Father, knowing that this was the only Law

Ordained by the Gods of Eternity, that would Exalt Immortal Beings to Kingdoms, Thrones, Principalities, Powers and Dominions, and [that would qualify us to be] Heirs of God and Joint Heirs with Jesus Christ, [and] to [receive] a Fullness of Celestial Glory. I say, the God of Israel knowing these things, Commanded Joseph Smith, the Prophet, and the Latter-Day Saints, to obey this Law, "or you shall be damned," Saith the Lord.

¶ Now, after obeying this law for many years, the Congress of the United States, and the Supreme Judges of the Nation, stand forth and say, "You shall be damned if you do obey it." Now ye Latter-day Saints, what are you going to do under these circumstances? God says, "We shall be damned if we do not obey the law." Congress says, "We shall be damned if we do." It places us precisely in the same position that it did the Hebrews in the fiery furnace, and Daniel in the Den of Lions. The Enemies of Daniel counseled together and Said, "We cannot find any occasion against Daniel, except we find it against him Concerning the Law of his God." Our Enemies have pursued the Same Course, and the Lawmakers and Judges of the Nation have Joined them, and made it a Law of Offence to Obey one of the Laws of Our God. Now who shall we obey, God or Man? (Acts 5:29) My voice is that we shall obey God. We have but a short time to live here; we have a long Eternity to live on the other Side of the Vail. Thus situated, the Matter is taken entirely out of our hands. The warfare is now between God and the Nation.

¶ I am an American Citizen. I was born and raised in the State of Connecticut. I wish to ask the Lawmakers and Judges of the government a few questions: By what power was Columbus inspired and moved upon to plead before the courts of Europe to assist him to fit out a fleet, to cross the Ocean and to find a western Continent? By what power was he protected until he accomplished this? By what Power were our forefathers inspired to Cross the Ocean to inherit this land? And when they had inherited the land, and the yoke of bondage laid upon their necks by their mother country became too grievous to be borne, they rose up as a Nation and Declared their Independence, and passed through an Eight Years' War at the Expense of much Blood and treasure, and finally obtained their Liberty [and] Independence, and Established a Free and Independent Government, which was acknowledged by the

Nations of the Earth? By what power was the Constitution of the United States Inspired, Framed and Adopted, as the Supreme Law of the Land, to be handed down as a Rich Legacy to their Posterity from Generation to Generation?

¶All these Blessings have been obtained buy the Inspiration of Almighty God and the will of Heaven. This glorious Instrument Guarantees unto all its Citizens the rights of [Freedom of] Religion, Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. The right of the Enjoyment of [Freedom of] Religion of any Citizen of this Republic, has never been questioned by any Congress or Judges of the Law, until of late, when both the Congress of the United States and the Supreme Judges of the Law, sought by their action to deprive a Hundred and Fifty Thousand of her Citizens of the right to Enjoy [the Freedom of] their religion, which the Constitution Guarantees unto them. Will not the same God who has given this Nation a Free Government and an Inspired Constitution of Equal Rights to all men who inhabit its broad domain, hold the Rulers [of the] Land and [the] Judges of the Law Responsible for the use they make of the Power in their hands? He wil1!

¶The Congress of 1862, and the Supreme Judges of 1879, in their Acts and decisions, have taken a dangerous and fearful step; their Acts will Sap the very Foundation of our Government, and it will be rent asunder, and the God of Heaven will hold them Responsible for these things, for "what men Sow they will Reap, and the measure they mete unto others will be meted unto them," saith the Lord. (Gal 6:7; Psa 7:15–16; Job 4:8; Mosiah 7:30; D&C 1:10; 6:33) The Constitution once broken by the rulers of the Land, there will be no stopping place, until the Nation is broken in pieces, and no power beneath the Heavens Can save this Nation from the Consequences thereof; And all Rulers of this Nation, as well as other Nations, will have to give an account unto the Judge of all the Earth for the use they make of the power put into their hands. Virtue Exalteth a Nation, while sin is a reproach to any People.

¶The question was asked the Hebrews, "What God is there that is able to deliver you out of the Hands of King Nebuchadnezzar?" A righteous answer of faith was given, "We do not know that our God will deliver us out of your hands. But be it known unto thee O King that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image

which thou hast set up." So say I. As an Apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ, I will not Desert my Wives and my Children and Disobey the Commandments of God, for the Sake of accommodating the public Clamor of a nation Steeped in Sin and Ripened for the Damnation of Hell! I would rather go to Prison and to Death. If I would not, I would never be fit to associate with the Prophets and Patriarchs of old, and I could not but despise in my heart any man who professed to be a Latter-day Saint who would do otherwise. Why should we fear man who only has power to kill the body, more than him who has power to cast both body and Soul into Hell? Christ says, "When men speak all manner of Evil against you, and Persecute you for Righteousness sake, rejoice and be Exceeding Glad, for so persecuted they the Prophets and Apostles who were before you."

¶ I would say to all Israel, treat your wives and Children Kindly, and keep the Commandments of God and Trust in Him, and He will fight your battles. And I will say, in the name of Jesus Christ, the Son of the Living God, that "Mormonism" will live and prosper, Zion will flourish, and the Kingdom of God will stand in Power and Glory and Dominion as Daniel saw it, when this Nation is broken to pieces as a potter's vessel and laid in the dust, and brought to Judgment, or God never spoke by my mouth. Therefore I say to all the Saints throughout the world: Be Faithful and True to your God and to your Religion, to your Families and to Yourselves.

¶ Jesus of Nazareth has suffered death on the cross for the Redemption of the world, and his Apostles followed his example for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ — and Joseph Smith has proved to the Heavens and the Earth, to God, angels and men, that he would abide in his Covenants even [if it must needs be] unto death, and none of us shall be called to do anything more. Any of us, would certainly be ashamed to deny the faith [in order] to accommodate our Enemies, [and] then [after this to] meet the Prophets and Apostles in the Spirit World. May God forbid that this should be the case with any of the blood of Ephraim.

¶ I wish in this testimony to say that the time is not far distant when the rich men among the Jews may be called upon to use their abundant wealth to gather the dispersed of Judah, and purchase the ancient dwelling places of their fathers in and about Jerusalem, and rebuild the holy city and temple. For the Fullness of the Gentiles

has come in (3 Nephi 10:10–16), and the Lord has decreed that the Jews shall be gathered from all the Gentile nations where they have been driven, into their own land, in fulfillment of the words of Moses their law-giver. And this is the will of your great Eloheim, O house of Judah, and whenever you shall be called upon to perform this work, the God of Israel will help you.

¶ You have a great future and destiny before you and you cannot avoid fulfilling it; you are the royal chosen seed, and the God of your father's house has kept you distinct as a nation, for eighteen hundred years, under all the oppression of the whole Gentile world. You may not wait until you believe on Jesus of Nazareth, but when you meet with Shiloh, your King, you will know him. Your destiny is marked out — you cannot avoid it.

¶ It is true that after you return and gather your nation home, and rebuild your City and Temple, that the Gentiles may gather together their armies to go against you to battle, for to take a prey and to take a spoil, which they will do, for the words of your prophets must be fulfilled; but when this affliction comes, the same God that led Moses through the Wilderness, will deliver you, and your Shiloh will come and stand in your midst, and will fight your battles, and you will know him; and the afflictions of the Jews will be at an end; while the destruction of the Gentiles will be so great that it will take the whole house of Israel who are gathered about Jerusalem, seven months to bury the Dead of their Enemies, and the weapons of war will last them seven years for fuel, so that they need not go to any forest for wood.

¶ These are Tremendous sayings — who can bear them? Nevertheless they are true and will be fulfilled, according to the sayings of Ezekiel, Zechariah and other prophets. Though the Heavens and the Earth Pass away, not one jot or tittle [of the words of the Prophets] will fall unfulfilled.

¶ I would say to the Lamanites, if I Could speak to their understanding, that you are also a Branch of the House of Israel, and chiefly of the house of Joseph, and your forefathers have fallen through the same Examples of unbelief and sins, as have the Jews — and you, as their posterity, have wandered in Sin and Darkness for Many Generations — and you, like the Jews, have been driven and trampled under the feet of the Gentiles, and put to death through

your wars with each other and with the white men, until you are almost destroyed. But there is still a Redemption and Salvation for a Remnant of you in the Latter Days. It is time for you to cease shedding each other's blood, or making war upon your fellow man. Cease to destroy one another, learn to Cultivate the Earth and raise your food therefrom; call upon the Great Spirit to protect you and deliver you from Bondage and Darkness, and the Great Spirit will hear you and deliver you, and a Remnant of you will again become a Delightsome people, as your forefathers were when they kept the Commandments of God.

¶ Could I speak to the Ten Tribes of Israel, in that north country, I would say Call upon the God of your fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, that your Prophets may Come in Remembrance before God, that they may hear his voice and no longer stay themselves, but smite the rocks that the mountains of ice may flow down at their presence. "An highway shall be cast up in the midst of the great deep;" their enemies shall become a prey unto them. Bring forth your records and rich treasures unto the children of Ephraim, the Servants of the Lord in the land of Zion, and the boundaries of the everlasting Hills shall tremble at your presence, and you shall fall down and be Crowned with Glory, even in Zion, by the Hands of the servants of God, even the Children of Ephraim, and you shall be filled with Songs of Everlasting Joy; behold this is the "Blessing of the Everlasting God upon the Tribes of Israel, and the richer blessing upon the head of Ephraim and his fellows."

¶ These events referred to are but a very limited portion of the Revelations of God which are about to be fulfilled upon the heads of this Generation. I wish to warn all nations of the Judgments of God which are at their doors. Thrones will be Cast down, Nations will be overturned, Anarchy will reign, all barriers of Law will be broken down, and the Laws will be trampled in the dust. You are about to be visited with War, the Sword, Famine, Pestilence, Plague, Earthquakes, Whirlwinds, Tempests, and with the Flame of Devouring Fire. For by fire and the sword will God plead with all flesh, and the Slain of the Lord will be many. The anger of the Lord is kindled and his sword is bathed in heaven, and is about to fall upon Idumea, or the world. And who is able to abide these things? And who will stand when he appeareth? The fig trees are

leafing, and the Signs of all heaven and Earth indicate the Coming of the Son of Man. The seals are about to be opened; the plagues to be poured forth. Your rivers and seas will be turned to blood and to gall. And the inhabitants of the Earth will die of those plagues. And the unbelief of Great Babylon, with the whole Christian world, will not make the Truths of God without effect.

¶Let the world look, for example, at the Ancient Cities of the Nations. Where is Thebes, Tyre, Sidon, Nineveh, and Babylon the Great, which were built to defy all time and all power, but God himself? They were laid in the Dust and their inhabitants Destroyed, when they were Ripened in Iniquity, and this too, in fulfillment of the Word of God unto them through the voices of righteous men, who spake as they were moved upon by the Holy Ghost. In like manner was Jerusalem destroyed and the Jews scattered among the Gentiles in fulfillment to the words of Moses and Jesus Christ. Will the Lord any more spare the Cities of the Gentiles and Great Babylon, than the Ancient Cities and the Cities of the Jews. No! Verily No! (Rom 11:19–25)

¶The question may be asked why these Judgments are Coming upon the world in the last days? I answer because of the Wickedness of the inhabitants thereof. The very proclamation of the angel of God when he delivered the Fullness of the Gospel as [was Prophecied] in the Revelations of St. John was, "Crying with a loud voice, 'fear God and give glory to him for the hour of his judgment is come.'" And when that proclamation was made to Joseph Smith the Prophet (it was half a century ago), [since that time] "Light has come into the world, and Men Love Darkness rather than the Light, because their deeds are Evil." The Lord has raised up Prophets and Apostles who have cried aloud to this generation, with the proclamation of the Gospel for half a Century, and warned them of the Judgments which were to Come, and the inhabitants of the Earth have rejected this Testimony, and shed the blood of the Lord's Anointed, and persecuted the Saints of God, and the consequence is that "Darkness covers the earth, and Gross Darkness the [minds of the] people," (D&C 112:23; Isa 60:2) and the Lord is withholding his Spirit from the inhabitants of the Earth, and the Devil is Ruling over his own Kingdom, and Sin, Wickedness and Abominations of every kind have increased a hundred fold within the last few years, until the whole Earth is filled with Murders, Whoredoms, Blasphemies, and Every Crime in the Black Catalogue that was manifest

in the Antediluvian world, or Sodom and Gomorrah, until the whole Earth groans under its Abominations, and the Heavens weep, and all Eternity is Pained, and the Angels are waiting the Great Command to go forth and Reap down the Earth. (D&C 38:12; Rev 14:14–20)

¶ This testimony I bear to all Nations under Heaven. This is my faith, my belief and my opinion. I know they are True by the Inspiration of Almighty God. And the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States bears me out in the opinion, that the Constitution gives me the privilege of Enjoying my Belief, Faith, and Opinion in Religion, *if [or so long as] I do not act [upon it]*. Therefore the Acts and Execution of all these Tremendous Events I leave for the God of Heaven to Execute, which He most assuredly will. What I have spoken I have spoken, and I excuse not myself, and, "though the heavens and the earth pass away, my words will not pass away, but will all be fulfilled," saith the Lord of Hosts.

¶ I subscribe myself an Apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ, and member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Wilford Woodruff.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Woodruff's Journal states that he wrote this Epistle on February 22nd, and that on the 24th he addressed a "letter to President John Taylor & Council" concerning the "Testimony" which he had written, and his desire to have it published in "Zion and Babylon" and "to all Nations under Heaven". In continuing Woodruff's journal states that he copied this "12 page Testimony" into his diary during the 24th and 25th, however the "Testimony" itself is actually recorded a day later under the date of February 26th. His Journal addresses the Epistle from the "Saint George Temple", but according to the same record, he actually left Saint George 16 days earlier, in order to avoid Arrest and Imprisonment and did not return until 2 days after the date when his journal states the Epistle was copied into his record. In attempting to make harmony here, there is evidence within Woodruff's journal that he actually kept more than one copy of his record, and probably the second copy is what is presently housed in the LDS Church Historian's Office.

As Woodruff expressed himself, regarding the evening of the 7th of February 1879: "For the first time in my life I have had to flee away from my Enemies for the Gospels sake . . . [because]

they are now trying to arrest me on [charges of] Polygamy". In continuing Woodruff states that "I had to Leave St George at 7 o'clock [PM] — I got into a wagon from the Temple with David H. Cannon and drove all night." The following evening, after having travelled "55 miles", Woodruff states that he arrived at the home of George W. Lee — however he does not say where Brother Lee lived, at least not until 8 days later, when on the 16th of February, he states that he left Bunkerville and travelled for 28 miles and "Camped for the night in the desert near the Canyon." The following day, on the 17th, Woodruff states that: "We drove today through the Canyon and on to Santa Clara Settlement." Woodruff was staying in the Santa Clara Settlement when he composed his "Epistle", and remained there until the evening of February 28th, at which time he returned to Saint George, where he occupied an upper Room that had been prepared for him in the Temple.

The following entries from Woodruff's Journal establish the historical context in which his Epistle was composed:

¶ **Feb 7, 1879:** For the first time in my life I have had to flee away from my Enemies for the gospels sake or from any other Cause. They are now trying to arrest me on Polygamy — and as I had to Leave St George at 7 o'clock I got into a wagon from the Temple with David H. Cannon and drove all night.

¶ **[Feb] 8:** I found myself this morning in a great desert in the midst of Bareness with Cactus Prickly Pears, and Joshuas [a] 12 feet high [tree] filled with thorns — but [there was] not a spear of grass or anything that an Animal Could eat. We travelled all day with this kind of vegetation around me. We traveled after dark. I shot a goose in a stream of water. [I] broke his wing but He swam out of sight, left the water, took to the Hills, and travelled half a mile before we found him. I also Shot 2 ducks. I stopped for the night with George W. Lee who was very kind to me. He had but one Room. He gave me his bed. Brother Cannon slept with me. Distance 55 Miles.

¶ **[Feb] 9: Sunday:** I wrote 3 Letters to Wilford, James & J. D. T. McAllister and David left at 10 o'clock. I parted with him and George T. Cottom and I spent the day By myself.

¶ **Feb 10, 1879:** I took my gun in the morning. Went to the River and ponds. I shot 6 ducks and was weary at night. [Travelled] 10 Miles. . . . . .

¶ **[Feb] 12:** I traveled in the desert today some 8 Miles . . . . I thought in the Evening it might be wisdom for me to go to Salt Lake and I dreamed I was there and Bishop Hunter and others thought I was imprudent to expose myself as I did. I thought there were strange Men after me. . . . . .

¶ **[Feb] 15:** I went up to the Cotton gin with Br Lee. Shot one quail. I administered to Br Sprague and returned to my abode. . . . . .

¶ **[Feb] 16:** I Left Bunkerville and the Desert and traveled with David Cannon 28 Miles and Camped for the night in the desert near the Canyon. [Travelled] 28 Miles.

¶ **[Feb] 17:** We arose in the morning from our Bed on the ground and Cooked our Breakfast from a fire made of Dead Joshuas, a species of Cactus 12 feet high, 12 to 16 inches through which when dead makes a good fire. This desert abounds with the greatest variety of Cactus I ever saw. The Joshuas here are only 12 feet high. In California they grow 50 feet. We also have the Common Cactus 6 feet high, the Devils pincushion 3 feet, the snake Cactus 6 feet, The Yankee pin Cactus that is Covered with Regular pins with heads on that answer for use as well as sale pins. Then we have the Common Leaf Prickly Pear.

¶ We drove to day through the Canyon and on to Santa Clara Settlement. I stopped with a good kind friend who gave me a room by myself with a good fire, Bed, furniture, and a Plenty to Eat. I took a good supper then a Bath and Change of Clothing which I much needed after wandering in a dusty desert for a week. Brother David left for home. I went to bed and had a good nights rest. [Travelled] 25 Miles. . . . . .

¶ **[Feb] 18:** I arose this morning refreshed by sleep. Had a good Breakfast of Quails I shot yesterday. I wrote 2 letters to John Taylor and Council. Gave a history of my desert trip. . . . . .

¶ **[Feb] 19:** I wrote 9 Letters to Phebe, 6 to Emma & family, to Hill and Jaques. I spent the day Confined to my room.

¶ **Feb 20, 1879:** I wrote 9 Letters to day . . . . I gave Brother [Moses] Thatcher a full History of my Eight days travels in the desert. I spent the day Confined to my room. I do not have the out door Exercise that I feel that my system Needs.

¶ **[Feb] 21:** I wrote 2 Letters to Sorenson at the Valley House and to J. McAllister. I received 4 letters from G. Teasdale, James Bleak, Wilford & G. Q. Cannon.

¶ **[Feb] 22:** I wrote 6 Letters to Wilford, G. Q. Cannon, E. Snow & McAllister, G. Teasdale & J. G. Bleak.

¶ **[Feb] 23:** Sunday I wrote 3 Letters to Jaques, to Roskelly and John P. Sorenson. I received one letter from Sorenson, Complaining that He had not received any letters from me. I spent the day in my room writing.

¶ **[Feb] 24:** I wrote one letter to President John Taylor & Council Concerning the Testimony which I have written, to publish to both Zion and Babylon, to all Nations under Heaven, as far my testimony Can go. . . . .

¶ I Copied in this Journal, on the following 12 pages, My testimony which I have written to publish to the world.

¶ **[Feb] 25:** I finished today the Copying of my Testimony in this Journal. I wrote a letter to Bulah and a li[st?] to Jaques.

¶ **[Feb] 26:** I spent the day writing and reading. I wrote 4 letters to Susan, Eugenia, Pheb & Cozy Scholes.

¶ The following is a Copy of the Testimony of the Apostle Wilford Woodruff to be published to the whole world:

¶ St George Temple Feb 22 1879

¶ To the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter day Saints, throughout Zion and throughout the world, Greetings. I feel desirous to once more while in the flesh By the word of God and Testimony of Jesus Christ to bear my testimony unto you . . . . . .

¶ **Feb 27:** I spent this day in getting up a synopsis of my travels and life for forty four years, and have recorded it in the latter part of this Journal. But it does not include the Dedication of the fore part of this Journal.

¶ **Feb 28:** I spent the day in writing, and in the Evening I rode to St George and went to the Temple and occupied an upper Room prepared for me. I there Met Brother McAllister, Bleak, Cannon & Farnsworth. . . . . (***Wilford Woodruff's Journal,*** Vol. 7: <7 Feb–28 Feb 1879> 454–467)

PRESIDENT HEBER J. GRANT AND "THE ONE ANOINTED AND APPOINTED"

President Grant's contempt and impudent disregard for the Law of God, and the will of his predecessor is clearly portrayed by his actions. Certainly, in accordance with the Law of the Priesthood, this fact would weigh heavily against him ever being honored by God as "the one anointed and appointed".[36] That this is so is explicitly stated in the very same revelation which called Grant to be an Apostle in the quorum of the Twelve. Consider the following:

Thus saith the Lord to the Twelve, and to the Priesthood and people of my Church: Let my servants George Teasdale and ***Heber J. Grant*** be appointed to fill the vacancies in the Twelve . . . and then proceed to fill

up the presiding quorum of Seventies . . . . You may appoint Seymour B. Young to fill up the vacancy in the presiding quorum of Seventies, ***if he will conform to my law****: For it is not meet that men who will not abide my law shall preside over my Priesthood . . . . . .* for my Priesthood whom I have called and whom I have sustained and honored, *shall honor me and obey my laws, and the laws of my Holy Priesthood,* ***or they shall not be considered worthy*** *to hold my Priesthood*, saith the Lord. And let my Priesthood humble themselves before me, and *seek not their own will but my will; For if my Priesthood . . . do not acknowledge me* ***I will not acknowledge them***, saith the Lord; *for I will be honored and obeyed by my Priesthood*. (*UPR* Vol. 1, 83: <13 October 1882> 1–5, 15–17; see also 82: <June or July 1882> 14–15, 33; 81: <27 June 1882> 24–29, 46)

Just how this revelation was to be interpreted was established by President Taylor in certain. The following day after receiving this revelation, Taylor called a meeting and presented it to the First Presidency, the Quorum of the Twelve and the Presidents of Stakes. The following are Wilford Woodruff's minutes:

We held a meeting with the Presidency, Twelve Apostles and the Presidents of Stakes. Remarks were made by President Taylor. Then the Revelation was read. G. Q. Cannon spoke to us and said *how can we teach the people any law or principle that we do not keep ourselves?* Joseph F. Smith spoke upon several subjects upon the Patriarchal order of Marriage. President Taylor told what Joseph Smith said to him upon that subject & said *if we do not embrace that principle soon* ***the Keys will be turned against us*** for *if we do not keep the same law that our Heavenly Father has we cannot go with him.* ***The word of the Lord to us*** was that *if we did not obey that Law we could not go where our Heavenly Father dwells. A man obeying a lower law* ***is not qualified to preside over those who keep a higher law***.

W. Woodruff said he was glad the Quorum of the Twelve & Seventies was now to be filled and said that *the reason why the Church & Kingdom of God could not progress if we did not receive the Patriarchal Law of Marriage was that* ***it belonged to this dispensation***[37] as well as the Baptism for the Dead and any law or ordinance that belongs to this dispensation ***must be received by the members of the Church*** *or it cannot progress.* ***The leading men of Israel*** who are presiding over Stakes *will*

have to obey the Law of Abraham[38] ***or they will have to stop***.[39] (*Wilford Woodruff's Journal* 8: <14 Oct. 1882> 126)

We see in the above a clear cut interpretation of the revelation which President Taylor received the day previous, and this too, not only as it was understood by President Taylor, but also by George Q. Cannon, Joseph F. Smith and Wilford Woodruff. You will notice President Taylor warned the leaders of the Church that if they did not "soon" embrace the Principle and practice of Plural Marriage, the Keys would be turned against them. The 1890 Manifesto, ***as interpreted*** *by Heber J. Grant*, bears witness to the fact that ultimately the Church chose to obey wicked men rather than God, and that President Taylor's foreboding regarding the loss of the Keys came to be fulfilled in the person of Heber J. Grant.

---

[36]D&C 132:7

[37]Nearly six years later on May 17th, 1888, President Woodruff made another statement in the Manti Temple, wherein he affirmed that: *"We are not going to stop the practice of plural marriage* ***until the coming of the Son of Man****."* (Diary of Apostle Heber J. Grant, May 17th, 1888, as cited in *Church, State, and Politics: The Diaries of John Henry Smith*, edited by Jean Bickmore White <1990> 200–201)

Apostle John Henry Smith was also present and has left us the following record of this occasion in his diary:

Thursday, May 17, 1888 — Manti

"The following brethren met to have prayers at 10 A.M. in the Temple: Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, F. D. Richards, George Q. Cannon, Brigham Young, F. M. Lyman, H. J. Grant, D. H. Wells, John Smith, Jacob Gates, S. B. Young, John Morgan, Kanute Peterson, W. H. Fulsom, Jon. Sharp, A. H. Lund, D. D. McArthur, W. S. Snow, E. L. Parry, R. Campbell, J. B. Maiben, Henry Beal, Jas. G. Bleak, C. Wilkin, J. D. T. McAllister, W. S. Farnsworth, George Reynolds, A. Winters.

"B. Young prayed and the following brethren met in the circle, Bro. George Q. Cannon being mouth: Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, F. D. Richards, G. Q. Cannon, B. Young, F. M. Lyman, H. J. Grant, D. H. Wells, Jacob Gates, S. B. Young, John Morgan, J. D. T. McAllister, D. D. McArther, J. G. Bleak, M. F. Farnsworth, Kanute Peterson, Henry Beal, J. B. Maiben, A. H. Lund, George

Reynolds, C. H. Wilkin and myself.

"12 noon we met and after singing President Wilford Woodruff [gave] the Dedicatory Prayer. After which we shouted three times, Hosanna to God and the Lamb. Bro. Woodruff spoke a few words. Lorenzo Snow spoke. Bro. Geo. Q. Cannon talked very nicely, also B. Young.

"Bro. Woodruff spoke a few words again, among them he said ["]*We won't quit practicing Plural Marriage* ***until Christ shall come****."* F. M. Lyman spoke very nicely. President Woodruff dismissed us by prayer." (Church, State, and Politics: the Diaries of John Henry Smith, edited by Jean Bickmore White <1990> 200–201; For other sources on this see *Utah Historical Quarterly* 39: <Fall 1971> 359; The original manuscript is presently housed in Special Collections at the University of Utah Library)

[38]"The law of Abraham" is a phrase which comes from the Prophet Joseph Smith's 1843 revelation on Marriage, where it is used in the context of Plural Marriage in the New and Everlasting Covenant:

"I am the Lord thy God, and will give unto thee the law of my Holy Priesthood, as was ordained by me and my Father before the world was. Abraham received all things, whatsoever he received, by revelation and commandment, by my word, saith the Lord, and hath entered into his exaltation and sitteth upon his throne. Abraham received promises concerning his seed, and of the fruit of his loins — from whose loins ye are, namely, my servant Joseph — which were to continue so long as they were in the world; and as touching Abraham and his seed, out of the world they should continue; both in the world and out of the world should they continue as innumerable as the stars; or, if ye were to count the sand upon the seashore ye could not number them. This promise is yours also, because ye are of Abraham, and the promise was made unto Abraham; and by this law is the continuation of the works of my Father, wherein he glorifieth himself. Go ye, therefore, *and do* ***the works of Abraham****; enter ye into my law* and ye shall be saved. But if ye enter not into my law ye cannot receive the promise of my Father, which he made unto Abraham. God commanded Abraham, and Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham to wife. And why did she do it? *Because this was the law"* (D&C 132:28–34)

After the Prophet's death and for many years afterwards, these passages were often referred to and discussed by President Young, John Taylor and the other members of the Twelve and First Presidency, all of whom understood "the law of Abraham" as given in the above revelation to refer to having more than one wife in the New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage. The following are two examples of such statements:

Brigham Young: "Monogamy, or restrictions by law to one wife, is no part of the economy of Heaven among men. Such a system was commenced by the founders of the Roman empire. That empire was founded on the banks of the

Tiber by wandering brigands. When these robbers founded the city of Rome, it was evident to them that their success in attaining a balance of power with their neighbors, depended upon introducing females into their body politic, so they stole them from the Sabines, who were near neighbors. The scarcity of women gave existence to laws restricting one wife to one man. Rome became the mistress of the world, and introduced this order of monogamy wherever her sway was acknowledged. Thus this monogamic order of marriage, so esteemed by modern Christians as a holy sacrament and divine institution, is nothing but a system established by a set of robbers.

"The Congress of the United States have lately passed a law to punish polygamy in the Territories of the United States and in other places over which they have exclusive jurisdiction. In doing this, they have undertaken to dictate the Almighty in his revelations to his people, and those who handle edged tools, unless they are skillful, are apt to cut their fingers; and those who hand out insult to the Great I Am, in the end, are apt to get more than they have spoken for.

"Why do we believe in and practice polygamy? Because the Lord introduced it to his servants in a revelation given to Joseph Smith, and the Lord's servants have always practiced it. "And is that religion popular in heaven?" It is the only popular religion there, for this is the religion of Abraham and, *unless we do the works of Abraham*, we are not Abraham's seed and heirs according to promise. (*Journal of Discourses* Vol. 9: <July 6, 1862> 322)

Franklin D. Richards: "The Latter-day Saints claim to be the children of Abraham, and if they are the children of Abraham, they will do the works of Abraham. It was difficult for men and women from all parts of the world, who had lived in the monogamic order all their lives to accept this doctrine of the eternity and plurality of marriage. It was "a new and everlasting covenant; and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned, saith the Lord." This was the obligation that was laid upon the Prophet Joseph, and through him, upon the true believers of the Church, even all who were worthy to accept of these obligations. It was herein that the Elders and their wives extended their faith, enlarged their obedience, and accepted the terms of the new and everlasting covenant extending not through time only, but eternity also." (*Journal of Discourses* Vol. 26: <October 1885> 341)

In keeping with this same doctrine, in 1886, when under great pressure both within and without the Church to relinquish Plural Marriage, President Taylor went to the Lord and inquired "concerning the New and Everlasting Covenant and how far it is binding upon my people." Among other things, in responding, the Lord revealed the following:

"I the Lord do not change and my word and my covenants and my law do not. And as I have heretofore said by my servant Joseph all those who would

enter into my glory must and shall obey my law. And have I not commanded men that if they were Abraham's seed and would enter into my glory they must do ***the works of Abraham***. *I have not revoked this law* ***nor will I*** for it is everlasting and those who will enter into my glory must obey the conditions thereof, even so Amen." (*UPR* 88:1, 6–9)

[39]That this edict became Church policy is demonstrated three years later in the case of Bishop John Sharp. The following review of this case is taken from an article which was written by James Allen, and published in the *Utah Historical Quarterly*:

On September 29, 1885, Mormon Bishop Hiram B. Clawson joined his son, Rudger, as a convict in the Utah Territorial Penitentiary. Both were imprisoned for violating a constitutional law of the land — the law against plural marriage. But before going to prison Bishop Clawson expressed no regrets for what he had done. "To me there are only two courses. One is prison and honor, the other is liberty and dishonor." (*Deseret News*, September 29, 1885)

Two days later another Mormon bishop, John Sharp, sat before the Salt Lake Stake High Council. Because he had recently decided to obey the law of the land by giving up plural marriage, and to counsel others to do so, he was required to resign his bishopric. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, November 7, 1885)

* * * * * *

The judicial crusade of the 1880s created a garrison attitude among the Saints. They defended the principle of plural marriage with stepped-up fervor, and for a short time the number of new plural marriages actually increased. After prosecution began under the Edmunds Act, more than a thousand judgments were imposed for unlawful cohabitation. In addition, otherwise law-abiding citizens took up residence on the underground — that is, went into hiding to escape prosecution. Among these were the First Presidency of the church and most of the Council of the Twelve Apostles. Those who served time in prison suffered great indignity for conscience' sake and became heroes in the eyes of their coreligionists. The Saints gave the impression of presenting a solid front, but within the ranks there were differing perspectives on what their obligations ultimately must be. The stories of Rudger Clawson and Bishop John Sharp bring that issue into dynamic focus. . . . . .

On November 3, 1884, young Clawson received his sentence. What passed between judge and convict on that day brought into sharp focus the conflicting attitudes toward civil disobedience. When asked to show cause why judgment should not be pronounced, the prisoner simply stated:

I very much regret that the laws of my country should come in contact with the laws of God, but whenever they do I shall invariably choose the latter. If I did not so express myself I should feel unworthy of the cause I represent . .

. . The law of 1862 and the Edmunds Law were expressly designed to operate against marriage as practiced and believed in by the Latter-day Saints. They are therefore unconstitutional, and of course cannot command the respect that a constitutional law would. That is all I have to say, your honor. (An account of the trial and conviction is in Whitney, *History of Utah* 3:293–319, see p. 318 for above citation; *Deseret News*, November 3, 1884)

The judge seemed surprised and, leaning back in his chair, meditated for more than a minute before he replied. He denied that the Constitution protected the practice of polygamy and declared,

While all men have a right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and to entertain any religious belief that their conscience and judgment might reasonably dictate, they have not the right to engage in a practice which the American people, through the laws of their country, declare to be unlawful and injurious to society. (Whitney, *History of Utah* 3:318; *Deseret News*, April 25, 1884; November 3, 1884)

The Judge would have been more lenient, he said, if Clawson had not openly declared that he believed it right to violate the law. The resulting sentence was three and a half years in prison and a $500 fine for polygamy, plus another six months and $300 for unlawful cohabitation.

So Rudger Clawson marched off to prison, one of many heroes among the Saints because, like Paul of old, he was incarcerated for conscience' sake. . . . . He was released on December 12, 1887, having served just over three years. Within two weeks he was made president of the Box Elder Stake . . . . .

In contrast to Rudger Clawson, John Sharp was ill and aging when his case arose in 1885. He was nearly sixty-four, and his impressive life story made it impossible to predict that when confronted with a choice he would act differently from the hundreds of Saints who went to prison for conscience' sake. . . . . .

Whatever his reason, on September 18[, 1885,] Bishop Sharp and his attorney walked into Judge Zane's court and changed his plea to guilty. The ailing bishop's lawyer then read a short but important statement, prepared by Sharp himself, explaining his position: "I hold myself amenable to the laws of my country, and in whatever degree I may have infringed upon the provisions thereof, am ready to meet the penalty." He explained, in words as loyal to the principle of plural marriage as those of any other Mormon stalwart, that he had entered polygamy in good faith, believing it to be the law of God, and that the Edmunds Act was a harsh law. Nevertheless, he had arranged his family relations to conform with the requirements of the law (meaning that he had arranged for separate maintenance for his wives) and that he was now living in harmony with the provisions against cohabitation. "It is my intention to do so," he said, "until an overruling Providence shall decree greater religious toleration in the land." He was then questioned briefly by the judge and promised that henceforth he would

obey the law of the land as interpreted by the courts. (*Deseret News*, September 19, 1885; *Salt Lake Tribune*, September 19, 1885)

To Judge Zane this was one of the choice opportunities he had been waiting for. Several months earlier another prominent Mormon, Orson P. Arnold, had become the first to take the same step, and the judge had fined him $300 but had not imposed a prison sentence. (Whitney, *History of Utah* 3:357–59) Others followed, and all were criticized by their brethren. Bishop Sharp, however, was the most prominent of them all, and his example, Zane reasoned, would help to persuade others to do the same. It "will have a more beneficial effect on society than any imprisonment would have," he said and imposed a $300 fine but no prison sentence.

The Saints in Salt Lake City were, for the most part, shocked and dismayed at the action of Bishop Sharp and, like a sudden thunderstorm, their words of disapproval descended upon him in torrents. Sharp visited the office of the *Deseret News* to ask for a merciful tone in the report of his case, but his own ward member, John Nicholson, acting editor who would soon go to prison himself for polygamy, considered him a mere compromiser trying to maintain his influence among railroad men. (As reported by George Cannon Lambert, "Journal of George Cannon Lambert," in Kate B. Carter, ed., *Heart Throbs of the West* 12 vols., Vol. 9: <Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1939–51> 364) The first editorial on the subject declared that Sharp had missed the "one opportunity of his life" to sustain a principle he believed to be divine, criticized him severely for agreeing to obey the law according to the interpretation of the court, and held that in spite of his precarious health and the fact that "incarceration in prison might have proved disastrous, if not fatal, to him," he was totally wrong to acquiesce.

> No matter how dark the clouds that are now apparently frowning upon the people of God, the good ship Zion will weather the storm. It may rage for a season, after which the turbulent waters will subside. Meanwhile there must be, of what God has given to the Saints, no surrender. (*Deseret News*, September 19, 1885)

This was only the beginning. Brigham Young, Jr. reflecting the sentiment of many churchmen, recorded in his diary: "To my understanding he rejected in total the doctrine of celestial marriage." (Brigham Young Jr. Journal, September 19, 1885, LDS Archives) The *Ogden Daily Herald* declared that Sharp had lost the grand opportunity of his lifetime. (September 21, 1885) Heber J. Grant refused to comment on Sharp's action publicly, but he wrote to Joseph F. Smith, "Regarding Bishop Sharp and others I must say that I cannot find words to express my regrets at their action." (*Salt Lake Tribune*, September 19, 1885; Grant to Smith, November 6, 1885, Heber J. Grant Letterbooks, LDS Archives) Smith, in turn, wrote to George Q. Cannon from Hawaii,

> I am truly sorry for Br. John Sharp . . . . I can see no way for him but repentance, and a full acknowledgement of his error and a full return to the responsibilities devolved upon him by reason of the covenants he has made. This

would no doubt be hard to do, perhaps impossible for him now, but it would be to me a thousand times preferable to the "humble pie" upon which he now feeds . . . . Truly the material of which martyrs were made in olden times has become very scarce in these latter days in the civilized world. (Smith to Cannon, November 12, 1885, Joseph F. Smith Letterbooks, LDS Archives) . . . . . .

In desenting from the dissenters, Sharp found his church position affected. . . . .

His immediate superior, Salt Lake Stake President Angus M. Cannon, was even then serving time in the penitentiary for the very offense for which Sharp escaped imprisonment. Cannon had sought to conform to the spirit of the law, as he understood it, by providing separate apartments for his plural wives and by not actually living with them in a connubial sense. He visited them in the daytime, sometimes ate meals with them, but scrupulously refrained from normal husband-wife relationships. This, he believed, would save him from being convicted of unlawful cohabitation. Judge Zane thought differently, and Cannon was convicted and sentenced on May 9, 1885, to the usual six months in prison and $300 fine. Cannon appealed to the United States Supreme Court on the grounds that unlawful cohabitation had been wrongly defined by Judge Zane, but the Supreme Court upheld the Utah judge. Cannon was released from prison on December 14, 1885, and immediately went into hiding to avoid a threatened rearrest on similar charges. (See discussion of this case in Whitney, *History of Utah*, 3:334–39, 357–58, 363–72, 388–89, 392–94. See the Supreme Court decision in 116 U.S. 55. Cannon actually spent an extra two months, voluntarily, in prison in order to have his appeal tested in the Supreme Court.)

Sharp's stake leaders could hardly be expected to show much leniency under the circumstances. Indeed, they were still preaching that plural marriage was essential to salvation and were intensely critical of those who would bend in the least degree. In May, before he went to prison, Angus Cannon had stated in a stake conference that "when a man professing to be a Latter-day Saint will cower before our enemies and beg for mercy, forgetting or renouncing the promises of God, he considered him a contemptible hypocrite." In a stake priesthood meeting in October a speaker declared from the pulpit that no faithful man would submit even though prison stared him in the face and that any priesthood holder who failed to sustain the law of God (that is, polygamy) forfeited his right to rule in the midst of his people. (Salt Lake Stake, "Historical Record, 1880–1890," May 1, 1885, pp. 422–33; October 3, 1885, p. 457, LDS Archives). It was even being preached in the stake that people must be firm believers in plural marriage before they could obtain recommends to participate in the Mormon temple ceremonies. In one instance a man went to the Logan Temple wanting to have a dead woman sealed to him. He was denied the privilege because he had only one wife even though he had had ample opportunity to obtain another. A bishop from the Salt Lake Stake who was a polygamist was allowed to have the dead woman sealed to him. (Salt Lake Stake, "Historical Record, 1880–1890," pp. 470–71, LDS Archives)

Five days after his court appearance, Bishop Sharp was called in by Joseph E. Taylor, acting president of the Salt Lake Stake. The bishop, along with his son James, talked with Taylor for nearly two hours. Earlier, Taylor had requested in writing that Sharp cease functioning as a bishop until the matter was settled, and in this interview he asked Sharp to resign. Sharp refused, and that night Taylor reported at length to the high council, suggesting that Sharp be called in to justify himself. The council agreed. (Salt Lake Stake High Council Minutes, 1882–1887, September 23, and October 1, 1885, pp. 652, 657–65, LDS Archives) On September 29 the council again discussed Bishop Sharp's intransigence . . . . . The council voted to summon Bishop Sharp on the evening of October 1.

It was a long night. Taylor reviewed in detail his conversation with John and James Sharp on September 23. Bishop Sharp then spoke from what must have been a deeply emotional and difficult position for him, attempting to counteract the barrage of accusations directed toward him. . . . . .

The council's discussion then turned to whether John Sharp should resign as bishop. Sharp saw no reason to resign, for in his mind he had done nothing to deny the faith. Taylor, on the other hand, contrasted Sharp's action with that of Bishop Hiram B. Clawson who had refused to do as Sharp had done, that is, "promise to live within the law as construed by the courts." As a result, Clawson and his wives and family had been insulted in open court. Furthermore, Taylor reminded the council, "The President of this Stake, Bro. Angus M. Cannon, is now suffering imprisonment for doing exactly the opposite to that which the Bishop has done." In Taylor's view, once Sharp had given his pledge to counsel others to obey the law he could not properly serve in the capacity of a bishop, for he must counsel people against what the church considered right. Finally . . . . ***Taylor reminded him of a revelation recently received by John Taylor that included the words, "For it is not meet that men who will not abide my law shall preside over My priesthood***." . . . . . He then announced that John Sharp had rendered himself ineligible to retain his office as bishop of the Twentieth Ward. A vote was taken, and ten members of the council voted to sustain the decision while three, John Rumel, Hosea Stout, and John T. Caine, abstained. Sharp asked to have the matter referred to the First Presidency — which the council agreed to do . . . .

A transcript of John Sharp's hearing was sent to the First Presidency . . . . . On November 3, 1885, the First Presidency officially sustained the action of the Salt Lake Stake in requiring John Sharp to resign as bishop. (*Salt Lake Tribune*, November 7, 1885; Salt Lake Stake High Council Minutes, 1882–1887, November 10, 1885, p. 709) . . . . . ("'Good Guys' Vs. 'Good Guys': Rudger Clawson, John Sharp, and Civil Disobedience in Nineteenth Century Utah", by James B. Allen, *Utah Historical Quarterly* Vol. 48: <Spring 1980> 148–171)

DISCOURSE BY PRESIDENT JOHN TAYLOR,
Delivered in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, Monday and Tuesday. Semi-Annual Conference, October 6 and 7, 1884.
Reported by John Irvine ***JD*** *25:303*

President Taylor continuing his remarks said: We have many specimens of the characters referred to in this revelation read by Brother Cannon. These things continue to exist more or less. Some people are very desirous sometimes to instruct me about how I ought to manipulate and manage affairs. Well, if they were set as my instructors I should be much pleased to get all the information I could from them, and I would be pleased to get information from the humblest person in existence—if it was information. Among other things I find that a good many begin to think that we are very much persecuted and proscribed in our marital relations, according to the revelations which God has given us, and there is sometimes a little trembling in the knees. I am pleased there is not much of it, but there is a little once in a while. Sometimes I get advice from outsiders, from the newspapers, etc., and sometimes from some of our brethren, (but from very few of our brethren) in relation to these matters.

God has given us a revelation in regard to celestial marriage I did not make it. He has told us certain things pertaining to this matter, and they would like us to tone that principle down and change it and make it applicable to the views of the day. This we cannot do; nor can we interfere with any of the commands of God to meet the persuasions or behests of men. I cannot do it, and will not do it.

I find some men try to twist round the principle in any way and every way they can. They want to sneak out of it in some way. Now God don't want any kind of sycophancy like that. He expects that we will be true to Him, and to the principles He has developed, and to feel as Job did—"Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." Though other folks would slay us, yet we will trust in the living God and be true to our covenants and to our God. These are my feelings in relation to that matter. We have also been told that "it is not mete that men who will not abide my law shall preside over my Priesthood," and yet some people would like very much to do it.

Well, they cannot do it; because if we are here, as I said before, to do the will of our Father who sent us, and He has told us what to do, we will do it, in the name of Israel's God—and all who sanction it say Amen—(the vast congregation responded with a loud "Amen.")—and those that don't may say what they please. (Laughter.) If God has introduced something for our glory and exaltation, we are not going to have that kicked over by any improper influence, either inside or outside of the Church of the living God. We will stand by the principles of eternal truth; living we will proclaim them, and dying we will be true to them, and after death will live again in their enjoyment in the eternal worlds. That is my feeling; so I don't feel very trembly in the knees, and I do not think you do, generally. I see sometimes a disposition to try to ignore some of the laws which God has introduced, and this is one of them. People want to slip round a corner, or creep out in some way. There is something very creepy about it. There was a man in former times we are told, came to Jesus by night. His name was Nicodemus. He was one of those persons who did not like the daylight. I have known some people who would want to be baptized in the evening, or get into some corner that they might not be seen. Well, there is not much to such folks. Jesus was very unpopular, quite as unpopular as we are, in His day. Nicodemus was a prominent man among the Jews, and he thought it might injure his reputation if he was seen visiting that Nazarene, to get instruction from Him, so he crawled in at night. Jesus talked quite plainly to him, as you can read for yourselves; but we find some folks of a similar kind now creeping around. They have not the manhood to stand true to their colors and to their God. Some folks think that we polygamists are very much indebted to our brethren who are monogamists to help to steady the ark, (God save the mark!)—(Laughter.)—to help to save us, and that we need such men in the Legislature, etc., and to fill our various offices. Well, I won't tell you all I think about some of these things, but I do think we are all of us dependent upon God our Heavenly Father, and if He don't take care of us we shall not be taken care of; if His arm is not extended in our behalf we shall have a poorshowing; but if God is with us, we ask no odds of the world, for He governs the destinies of the human family. He puts down one man and exalts another. He dethrones one king or president as the case may be,

and sets up another, and He rules as He pleases among the nations of the earth and all the children of men, although they don't know it. We live in him, we move in Him, we have our being from Him. We are not dependent very much upon the monogamists about any of these things. You need not plume yourselves very much in these matters; and I will tell you, if you want to get along smoothly, you had better find among your various neighbors, when you have some matter of difficulty to settle, some of these polygamists and ask a little counsel at their hands. They will be able to advise you about many things, especially if they are men of God, humble men, living their religion and keeping the commandments of God. (*Journal of Discourses* Vol 25:309–310)

November 20th, 1884
President George Q. Cannon

There have been, and still are, perhaps, some who call themselves Latter-day Saints, who are almost ready to lend themselves to any scheme that has for its object the obtaining of a State organization for Utah. Such persons look upon this as so great a blessing and so great a boon, that they are almost willing to forego their religious belief and to pander to those who have got power, and to make some sort of a concession to them, in order to achieve this, what they consider, very desirable end. There has been some agitation in years past respecting plural marriage, and some people, calling themselves Latter-day Saints, have been almost ready to go into the open market, and bid for a State government, at the price of conceding this principle of our religion, for the privilege of becoming a state of the Union. Those who are ready to do this are ready also to cast off obedience to the Priesthood of the Son of God, and to say, "We do not believe that men who hold an office in the Church should have any voice in the affairs of the State." They are ready to sell out their belief as Latter-day Saints, and their veneration and reverence for that power which God has restored, for the sake of obtaining a little recognition of their rights as citizens, on the part of those in power. It does not require such familiarity with the Spirit of God, or with the principles of our holy religion to understand exactly the position that such persons as these to whom I allude, occupy among

us. When a man is ready to barter any principle of salvation for worldly advantage, that man certainly has reached the position that he esteems worldly advantage above eternal salvation. Can such persons retain the Spirit of God, and take such a course as this? No, they cannot. That other spirit will lead such persons astray, and they will be left to themselves. (*JD* 26:7–8)

March 29, 1885
Apostle George Reynolds

I have met a few in our midst who seemed to have an idea that there was a Gospel of compromise, if I may so use the term, that might be advocated. In all the history of this world, from its creation to the present, I have never read of, never heard of the time when God Almighty compromised with the Evil One; when He was willing that evil should have a place in the midst of His people; when He was willing that any of the principles of eternal truth should be relinquished by those of His sons and daughters, to whom He had revealed them. No. The word of instruction, the word of revelation, the word of counsel has always been for man to live by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God [D&C 98:4–14]; to keep inviolate the ordinances of God; to preserve the principles of truth and righteousness intact, and never to consider for one moment that man can gain his salvation by giving up or resigning any principle or law that God has said is necessary for the accomplishment of His purposes, which purposes we understand to be the salvation of mankind and the redemption of the world. Any plan less than the one devised by Him is imperfect; anything else will not save the first one of us. It is God's law and God's law alone that will deliver Israel from his enemies. It is by perfect confidence in the word of the Lord, and by willing, humble obedience to all His requirements, accepting all His providences as for our best good, that we shall be delivered. Do you ever recollect? Have you ever heard of a time in any age or dispensation since this earth first rolled forth from the presence of God, that men professing to be His servants have gained anything in this life or for the next

by faltering in their obedience to the requirements of heaven, by laying aside the armour of faith, by turning from that which they had espoused, and which they realized to be of God? If you have ever heard of such a people, if you have ever known such a time, your reading and your experience have been different to mine. Judging by the experience of the Saints in the past, and judging by our own experience in this dispensation — as far as I know it has all gone to prove that the closer we cleave to the Lord, the nearer He will draw unto us, the greater will be the manifestations of His power in our behalf, and the sooner will be our triumph over those who seek to injure us. (*JD* 26:159–160)

Wednesday, April 1st, 1985
A *Deseret Weekly News* Editorial by
Charles W. Penrose

The peculiar situation of affairs locally is developing some interesting features. It is being predicted by some of the rabid persecutors of the "Mormons" that the Church will, by the relentless application of a remorseless squeezing process, be forced into making certain concessions. According to this new class of prophets the anticipated conceding will consist of the renunciation of certain tenets of the faith of the Latter-day Saint — notably the doctrine of plural marriage. It is expected that this abrogation of a prominent religious principle will be brought about by a revelation emanating from the head of the Church.

We feel called upon to treat this lately expressed expectation to a cold bath. It has not the most fragile basis upon which to rest. It is conceived in error, and consequently cannot be realized. Those who indulge in it have no conception of the character of the Church. They demonstrate by their predictions that they imagine it to have originated in and to be conducted by fraud. On the contrary the Church was organized and established under divine commandment, and is carried forward by the will and direction of God.

When men talk so flippantly about revelations setting up one doctrine or uprooting another, they speak in ignorance. It is the province of the Head of the body-religious to receive revelation to the Chruch or for its benefit and instruction, but he is not the source

of these communications. He is the medium through whom they are given. From the standpoint of a Latter-day Saint thoroughly imbued with the faith and spirit of the gospel, prognostications from outside sources to the effect that a revelation either establishing or repudiating a doctrinal point would be received either in the near or distant future is exceedingly absurd. They could only be based on the erroneous estimate that revelations can be cut, dried or made to order according to the will of man. On the contrary they express the will of God given through the channel which He has appointed, as in days of old. And every true disciple is entitled to possess sufficient of the spirit by which they are given to enable him to understand and receive the revelations of God when they are presented to him, and to detect without difficulty the spurious article, should anything of that character be offered. Those who do not possess that spirit, or witness, are liable to fall, because they are open to deception.

Speaking from the basis that the revelation on celestial or patriarchal marriage was given of God, what an absurdity is here presented of people indulging in the vain anticipation that Omnipotence would yield by the process of obliteration of a divine law on account of human pressure. God having given the doctrine, for a wise purpose known to himself suffers those who have sought to do His will and incidentally others who have not advanced in that direction, to be placed at a temporary disadvantage, for it is necessary that men should be tried, that they may be proven, and proven that they may be educated. Doubtless when the object for which the present crusade has in the providence of the Almighty, been permitted, is accomplished, He will overrule it for the advancement and benefit of those who have not flinched nor proved recreant during the ordeal. But no revelation from man will ever set aside any doctrine of the Church. Man of himself has no power in the premises. If that which has been divinely appointed is abrogated, that process must be operated by the same power. No other can touch it. It is not within merely human province. In the light of this position it is positive folly for men to talk about a revelation being given upon any point connected with the Church, as nothing but a revelation in advance of the one anticipated could enable any mortal man to know anything at all upon such a subject.

It is claimed that some "strong 'Mormons" are imbued more or

less with this expectation or at least hope, that a revelation of the character referred to will be received. There may be a few persons claiming a membership in the Church who are tinged more or less with this theory, but the fact of their being impregnated with such an idea is of itself the best possible indication that their strength, so far as the Gospel is concerned, consists of the most paltry weakness. There may be a few who are inclined to that condition of mind, but we believe their numbers to be small. And whatever inclinations they may have in that direction are doubtless in the form of a hope that such a consummation will be reached, imagining perhaps that it might end their difficulties. Even if it should ever reach that point, however, the expectation of permanent peace from that cause is vain. The polygamy bugbear is merely a subterfuge employed by the anti-Mormons as an excuse for the perpetration by them of villainous outrages. Many of the most prominent among them have frequently and openly admitted as much. Members of the Church who feel and talk favorably for abrogation of doctrinal points are the reverse of "strong." They probably belong to a class who believe in the fulness of the Gospel as restored through Joseph Smith, and almost wish they didn't, or at least that it was not true. They would like to do the will of God providing it was strictly in accordance with their own. They desire to adhere to the Church because they cannot rid themselves of the conviction that it is the power of God unto salvation, but they would like its doctrines and ways to be more in conformity with those of the world, that every species of friction which causes discomfort and temporal disadvantage might be avoided. In fact, they are "conservative 'Mormons." Another term for men who, if the Church of Christ were manipulated by them, would doubtless adopt a policy of giving up religious rights piecemeal until every distinguishing feature between the Saints and the world would disappear, and they would be loved all over the earth because they would be swallowed up by the world which loves its own. It would result in another universal apostacy, similar to that which took place shortly subsequent to the time of Christ's earthly mission.

But, coming back to the starting point, all anticipations and predictions regarding the reception of revelations to the Church are necessarily premature. The faithful who seek to know and do the will of God, will not be shaken of purpose, neither will they

abandon their religious principles in whole or in part, under any kind of pressure whatever. They will hold to their integrity in the full expectation of, sooner or later, beholding the salvation of God. (*The Deseret News Weekly* <April 1, 1885> 167)

CHARLES W. PENROSE EDITORIAL

---

23 April 1885

An Editorial written by Charles W. Penrose for the Deseret Evening News on the 23rd April 1885. (Deseret Evening News Editorial, 23 April 1885; **MHP Vol 1:376–379)**

¶The flow of the tide has set in against the Saints. It looks as if no popular movement was favoring them. The executive, legislative, judicial and religious influences are against them, and to these is added a more or less widespread popular clamor. The object of this furore, backed up by threats of stripping the people of what few rights remain, of imprisonment and family and communal disruption is to force the Saints to relinquish a prominent doctrine of their religion. The whole reasoning of friends, real and professed, and of bitter and relentless foes, on the outside, takes this one and only direction.

¶One of the reasons adduced more frequently than any other in favor of the demand that plural marriage relationship be abolished is that it is not religion. To this we have but to reply that if some one outside of the religious professor has the power to prescribe what his religion shall consist of all pretensions to the existence of religious liberty are a delusion and a snare, and a hollow and meaningless mockery. The only line of demarcation over which the exercise of religion must not step is that which divides its practice from the domain of the rights of others. It has never been shown, nor is it susceptible of exhibition, that the peculiar marital institution interferes with the rights and privileges of any, under the Constitution. Nobody outside of the relationship are injured, and therefore have no reason for complaint, neither has any power the right of interference. A remark lately attributed to General H. S. Eldredge, on this point appears strikingly appropriate.

It was to the effect that nobody was injured by the plural marriage relationship of the 'Mormons,' and if it be claimed that the women and children are, the refutation to that insinuation lies in the fact that it is not from them that the complaints are coming.

¶It has been held by some of the Saints that if even the doctrine against which the bulk of the opposition is hurled were abrogated or relinquished the clamor would not cease. The demand would still be made for a further retreat from religious principles, until the Church as an organized body-religious would become an entity of the past; otherwise popular thirst for the demolition of 'Mormonism' would not be satiated.

¶We look upon this as an erroneous conception of the character of the work in which the Saints are engaged. The chief object of the crusade is to get the Church to apostatize. That arrived at nothing more would be necessary for the satisfaction of the enemies of the work of God. That accomplished they would be jubilant and all hell would rejoice.

¶What would be necessary to bring about the result nearest the hearts of the opponents of 'Mormonism,' more properly termed the Gospel of the Son of God? Simply to renounce, abrogate or apostatize from the new and everlasting covenant of marriage in its fullness. Were the Church to do that as an entirety God would reject the Saints as a body. The authority of the Priesthood would be withdrawn, with its gifts and powers, and there would be no more heavenly recognition of the ministrations among the people. The heavens would permanently withdraw themselves, and the Lord would raise up another people of greater valor and stability, for his work must, according to His unalterable decrees, go forward, for the time of the second coming of the Savior is near, even at the doors. Therefore the Saints have no alternative but to stand by the truth and sustain what the heavens have established and propose to perpetuate. This they will do, come life or death, freedom or imprisonment, and there is, so far as we can observe, no use to attempt to disguise this fact.

¶As already stated, were the step so much desired on the outside to be taken, there would probably be but little need of any further opposition, because the Church would be shorn of its strength, having surrendered its integrity because of earthly op-

position. Its adherents would no longer be distinctive, but would be like the rest of the world, whose hate would turn to affection, because of the love it has for its own. The Saints might have the meagre satisfaction of having all men speak well of them, but it would be overshadowed by the miserable reflection that they were subject to the woe and misery consequent upon their getting into that lamentable situation.

¶ Individuals may falter and fall, as they doubtless will, when brought face to face with the testing point. They may be ready, for considerations connected with their personal convenience or safety, to renounce their religion, cast away their wives and render themselves perfidious in the eyes of their own offspring by this crouching apostasy, but the bulk will not follow examples of that character. Having the light of truth and manhood burning within their souls, they will, when the storm howls about their ears, continue to stand at the post of duty at which they were stationed when the sunshine of peace and prosperity smiled upon them. And if any who are in jeopardy feel as if the germ of faith were not as bright and powerful in themselves as they could wish, and they need an example after which to follow, let them not keep close to the heels of the craven, but tread in the footsteps of the man who will 'Do what is right, let the consequence follow.' Many hold that it is less cruel to a man's family to renounce them and the sacred contract by which to him they are bound, than take the probable alternative of having to go to prison and leave them, it may be in some instances, to fact poverty. There are some things, however, that to people of nobler instincts are worse than temporal hardships, and he is 'poor indeed' who does not take this stand. Poverty may be met and conquered, but the stain of the recreant can scarcely be wiped out. Besides from the standpoint of every true Latter-day Saint a renunciation of his religion has a blasting effect upon his hopes of eternal happiness, the foundation of which lies in the retention of his wives and children in the life to come. If he barters away his birthright for a mess of potage here, upon what ground has he reason to believe his heirship will receive any recognition hereafter?

¶ It goes without saying that the crusaders are anxious to obtain among those who are pursued by them as many examples of

recreancy as possible, not only on account of the satisfaction that such cases of themselves impart to them, but it is desired that they should have a strong effect in influencing others to take a similar course. The good Saints, however, can afford to suffer any species of discomfort, even to the sacrifice of life itself if it be necessary, but they cannot entertain the alternative of proving recreant to principle, to wives and children, and turning their backs upon their religion and their God. (*Deseret Evening News* Editorial, Charles W. Penrose, Editor)

May 1st, 1885
President George Q. Cannon Editorial
taken from *The Juvenile Instructor*

Editorial Thoughts

How often has the remark been made by people young in years or in the Church, "Oh! I wish I could have been with the Saints when they passed through their trials and persecutions in early days!" The wish is uttered with the idea, apparently, that there are to be no trials and persecutions in the future like those of the past. We remember in our boyhood when we indulged in this wish. . . . But we have long ago learned to be content to take our part in the scenes which belong to our day and time and which have been allotted to us. We have learned that there are plenty of trials and difficulties for all, if they will live faithful, to have their full share, and all that are necessary to test them and their faith and integrity to the fullest extent. . . . .

The violence of mobs was one of the chief difficulties the Saints had to meet in early days. This was a very painful and hard trial and involved great suffering and frequently death. But there are other trials which may test the faith equally as much as mobs. We have had some of them since the Church was led to these valleys. We shall continue to have them, and they will increase, and apparently look more and more threatening, as the Church increases in strength and experience. Just now we are passing through a trial which causes many to think and to wonder what the result will be, and there may be some, perhaps, who tremble and whose faith almost fails them.

A violent and vicious attack is being made upon the doctrine and practice of patriarchal marriage. Those who have practiced this principle are assailed with a ferocity never before known. Those who make the attack, perhaps hope to drive the people of God to renounce the doctrine and promise not to obey the revelation. Vain and delusive hope! Unless the Saints apostatize, such an action on their part is impossible. By doing so, they would deliberately shut the door of the celestial glory in their own faces. They would say by that action: "We do not have the valor necessary to sustain us in striving for the Celestial glory, and we therefore are content to enter a terrestrial or telestial glory." To comply with the request of our enemies would be to give up all hope of ever entering into the glory of God, the Father, and Jesus Christ, the Son. This is the prize which the Saints are asked to give for the world to cease their attacks upon them! Is it not a costly bargain which they are asked to make? To barter off all hope of eternal felicity with wives and children in the celestial presence of God and the Lamb for the miserable favor of the world! So intimately interwoven is this precious doctrine with the exaltation of men and women in the great hereafter that it cannot be given up without giving up at the same time all hope of immortal glory. With as great consistency might the Sons of God, who are to be crowned heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus, at the auspicious moment of their cornation, be asked by Satan to give up the thrones upon which they were being seated or the glorious crowns with which their brows were being encircled, in order to please him.

"But," we hear it said, "we do not ask you to give up your *belief* in this doctrine; we merely ask you to suspend for the time being your practice of it. Are you not justified in doing this, in face of the determined opposition of the world against this practice at present? Perhaps, after a while, the times may become more favorable to your practice of this principle."

We ask ourself, if some such reasoning as this was not indulged in during the times following upon the crucifixion of the Savior and the martyrdom of some of His disciples? No doubt there were men then, and in the church too, who thought it an unwise policy to force the issues which then existed between the world and the church to their legitimate conclusion. And after all the valient and true had perished their *policy* prevailed. Martyrdom did its

work, and then apostasy came forward and prevailed; and the so-called church stood, not the church of Christ, but a foul, corrupt heathenish, apostate church, from which the gifts, and graces, and blessings of the pure gospel and priesthood had been withdrawn. The saints of that day had presented before them martyrdom or apostasy. They who were valiant, who were true, who looked beyond this life, did not hesitate. To die was glorious, it was great gain; to live and be apostate, was to rob life here of its charm and all its pleasure and honor, and made life hereafter a condition of existence to be shrunk from with dread and horror.

The Latter-day Saints have not forced any issue upon the world. It has forced, and is forcing, one upon us. We did not, in obeying the revelations of God, violate law. We were innocent of this. But that which was no crime — that which God had commanded us to do — has been arbituarily declared to be a crime, and we are told we must not obey that command; for if we do, we shall be punished. The issue is in this way forced upon us, and the question presented before us is: Whom shall we obey? God gives us a command to obey: but man says we shall not obey it. To disobey God is to forfeit His favor and our eternal salvation. To disobey man is to expose ourselves to His punishment, and His vengeance may deprive us of mortal life.

Whom shall we obey? (XXX) is the great question for the Latter-day Saints. We think we hear their answer from every habitation, from every hamlet, from every town, city and valley, throughout all these mountains, to which the Lord our God has led us, and where faithful Saints dwell — "We cannot disobey our Great Creator and God; to obey Him is our first and foremost duty; if men punish us for this, we must invoke His grace and strength to enable us to bear all they may bring upon us."

This is the only answer faithful Saints can give; and as they did in the beginning of the work in these last days, as they did in Missouri, as they did in Illinois, as they did in crossing the great plains to find a home in these mountains, and as they have done from that time to the present, so they must do again — put their trust in God, that God who has never forgotten them, to deliver them from the hands of their enemies. And He will do it. He will not forget His people, nor the promises He has made to them.

Now if there are any who wish that they could have lived in

other times to share the trials of the Saints who then lived, let them be content. This is a day of trial, the qualities that were needed in former days to make Saints faithful to the truth are needed by you now, and you will have plenty of opportunities in the future to display them — fully as many as if you had lived in the Church fifty years ago. (*Juvenile Instructor* <May 1, 1885> 136)

May 15th, 1885
President George Q. Cannon Editorial
taken from *The Juvenile Instructor*

Topics of the Times
by the Editor

Predictions without number have been made to the Latter-day Saints respecting the trials they would have to meet to test their faith in the gospel. The Saints ought to be prepared for persecution and difficulty if they believed the testimony of the prophets, Apostles and Elders. These men would be false prophets unless severe trials did come. The Church has been constantly told that it must be prepared for every kind of tribulation and affliction, and that its members must be willing, if they expected to attain unto celestial glory, to lay down their lives for the truth.

Now that trials are upon us, and persecution against the law of patriarchal marriage is raging, it is a consolation for the leading officers of the church to know that these have not come upon the people unexpectedly and without warning. No member of the Church can truthfully say that he or she has been deceived, or lulled into a false security, or been urged to obey any principle of the gospel without being told the consequences that would be likely to follow such obedience.

These are interesting, and, it may be said, exicting times. But they are times in which Latter-day Saints should rejoice; for this is the command of the Great Head of the Church, the Savior Himself. He says:

"Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

This is precisely the position we are in, and we should rejoice that we are in such honorable company as that of the holy prophets, including our Redeemer Himself.

Such scenes as these are necessary for the people to pass through to prove and test them and to cause them to exhibit their true feelings. Honest, faithful people, who have the true courage of the gospel, will appear, at such times, to advantage. These qualities will be brought to the surface. They will be strong, full of courage, nerve and faith.

The unfaithful and the hypocrite, on the contrary, will be looking around for some way to escape the trial. They will be fearful, full of apprehensions and be ready to yeild or to run and abandon their faith. I have already heard that some of this class talk of compromise. What they mean by compromise, I suppose, is to give up some principle of the gospel and promise not to obey or practice it. As the principle of patriarchal marriage is the one now so savagely attacked, this is the one such persons are preparing themselves to yield. I view such men as apostates already at heart. They are more dangerous than our open enemies. Our open enemies we are prepared to resist. We look for nothing from them but opposition. But not so with those who have a standing in the Church. They are among us, are called Saints and are inside our citadel. They can betray us because of these advantages. Judas, as one of the twelve apostles, could do more towards betraying his Lord than would have been possible had he only been a Pharisee, or an open enemy of Jesus. Benedict Arnnold, as a trusted general in the Revolutionary army, could do far more towards betraying the cause of liberty and General Washington than any troy on the continent. William Law, as the counselor of the Prophet Joseph Smith, had advantages as a hypocrite and traitor, in secretly plotting against the life of the Lord's anointed, that no anti-Mormon confederate of his possessed.

Hence it is, that in all ages and among all people, traitors of this character have been execrated as the lowest and meanest of mankind. The very persons for whom they sell their souls, and whose infamous

tools they become, despise them. They only use them for the purpose of betrayal, and even then are distrustful of them, and throw them aside with contempt and scorn. Of what use was Judas after his act of perfidy? The men who had purchased him scorned him, as is apparent from their reply to him when he told them he had betrayed innocent blood: "What is that to us? See thou to that." . . . . . .

Thus is has been and thus it ever will be with people of this class.

There are men who say: "Yield this practice for the present; perhaps public opinion may soften and then this principle may be taught and practiced."

I look upon such a suggestion as from the devil. It would be quite as proper to propose apostasy for a short season until public opinion would become more favorable to us. If there are any in the church who cannot stand the pressure, instead of talking compromise, let them withdraw quietly from the Church. If they can see nothing in the principle of celestial marriage worth contending for, leave those who do see and appreciate its value to fight the battle alone. The latter will then neither be weakened nor betrayed by the association of those who, in their hearts, stand ready to yield. If there are men in the Church who love the world and its favor better than they do God and truth, or if they fear man's displeasure and punishment more than they love eternal exaltation, now is a good time for them to exhibit the feeling. But if they have any regard left for those who have been their friends and brethren, they ought not, while professing to be members of the church, be consorting with those who are its deadly enemies and assenting to their plans for the destruction of a vital principle of exaltation. They should have so much self-respect that, while professing to worship Jehovah, they will not prostrate themselves before the image of Baal. (*The Juvenile Instructor*, Vol. 20: <May 15, 1885> 156)

June 5th, 1885
Deseret Evening News
Editorial by Charles W. Penrose

Influences are at work whose object is to create an impression

in favor of the renunciation or ***temporary*** suspension of the law of celestial marriage. Arguments are being used to that end, in a semi-private way, with a view to gaining converts to that idea.

Perhaps such pleadings may influence a few people who are not in the habit of probing subjects to the bottom and are not particularly gifted with the power to analyze the motives by which men are actuated. Good Latter-day Saints, however, who have within themselves that needful reason for the hope that inspires them are not affected by the shallow pretexts of semi-apostates.

To give a Gospel coloring to the position assumed by those who express themselves as ready to sell out whatever hold they may have on the work of God, they complacently quote from the revelations contained in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants. Attempts are made to twist these divine communications from their plain intent, in order that they may subserve ulterior purposes. In this connection reference is made to the following, to be found on page 218:

"For verily I say unto you, my law shall be kept on this land.

"Let no man think he is ruler, but let God rule him that judgeth, according to the counsel of his own will, or, in other words, him that counseleth or sitteth upon the judgment seat.

"Let no man break the laws of the land, for he that keepeth the laws of God hath no need to bread the laws of the land:

"Wherefore, be subject to the powers that be, until He reigns whose right it is to reign, and subdues all enemies under His feet." [D&C 58:19–21]

It is argued — "If it is not necessary to break the law of the land in order to keep the law of God, why not renounce or abrogate celestial marriage?"

There is certainly a conflict between a law of God and an alleged law of the land. Those who understand and accept the revelation on celestial marriage to be what it purports to be, cannot consistently hold, on account of the foregoing quotation, that it should be set aside, in the face of the declaration — 'My law shall be kept on this land.' But if there really is a genuine law of the land in conflict with it, there is an apparent incongruity in the declaration as a whole.

What constitutes a genuine law of the land? This can be commensurately answered by stating the general proposition that the

Constitution is the 'Supreme law of the land,' and all statutes made in conformity with its provisions, in letter and spirit, are genuine laws. Those which conflict with it, according to that proposition are not. The Edmunds act is grossly unconstitutional, and therefore is not essentially a law of the land in the true sense of the term, because it is an infringement on constitutional privileges, being *ex post facto,* a bill of attainder, and a curtailment of religious liberty.

If it were a constitutional law there would be no conflict between it and the revelation on celestial marriage. There being a clash, there is no alternative but to sustain what God has given.

It may be urged that the Supreme Court has decided upon the right of Congress to pass the Edmunds act, and that settles the question of Constitutionality. It settles it in a legal sense, but not as a matter of fact. No statement from any source in existence could render the statute referred to Constitutional as a fact. And facts are stubborn things. The truth is what the Saints are seeking and what they propose to accept and stand by.

The Lord anticipated the passage of unconstitutional measures whose objects would be to oppose His law and afflict His people, as will be seen by a later revelation from which we will now quote, as found on page 342, Book of Doctrine and Covenants [i.e. D&C 98:4–15]:

"And now, verily I say unto you concerning the laws of the land, it is my will that my people should observe to do all things whatsoever I command them;

"And that law of the land which is constitutional, supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges, belongs to all mankind, and is justifiable before me;

"Therefore, I, the Lord, justify you, and your brethren of my church, in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land;

"And as pertaining to [the] law of man, whatsoever is more or less than these, cometh of evil.

"I, the Lord God, make you free, therefore ye are free indeed; and the law also maketh you free;

"Nevertheless, when the wicked rule the people mourn.

["Wherefore, honest men and wise men should be sought for diligently, and good men and wise men ye should observe to uphold; otherwise whatsoever is less than these cometh of evil.]"

[And I give unto you a commandment, *that ye shall forsake all evil*

and cleave unto all good, THAT YE SHALL LIVE BY EVERY WORD WHICH PROCEEDETH FORTH OUT OF **THE MOUTH OF GOD**.]

[For he will give unto the faithful line upon line, precept upon precept; and I will try you and prove you herewith.]

[And *whoso layeth down his life in my cause,* for my name's sake, ***shall find it again***, **EVEN LIFE ETERNAL**.]

[Therefore, *be not afraid of your enemies,* for I have decreed in my heart, saith the Lord, that I WILL PROVE YOU IN ALL THINGS, *whether you will abide in my covenant,* ***even unto death,*** **THAT YOU MAY BE FOUND WORTHY**.]

[For *if ye will not abide in my covenant* **YE ARE NOT WORTHY OF ME**.] [D&C 98:4–15,]

It will be here observed that laws which are "constitutional, supporting that principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges," are to be sustained. The Edmunds Act is infamously opposed to the liberties and privileges of those against whom it is aimed. Therefore it "cometh of evil" being destructive of human freedom. If there be those among the Saints, professing adherence to the Church, who are desirous of sustaining and upholding that which "cometh of evil" they can do so and take the consequences. But they should not be so inconsistent as to put forth ***the flimsy claim*** *that their course is sustained by the revelations of the Almighty*. They had better acknowledge that their faith in revelation has dwindled to a fine point, if it ever existed in their breasts at all, until it is scarcely discernable. They should at once proclaim themselves as unbelievers in the claim that the revelation on celestial marriage is of divine origin, or else admit that they do not possess the courage of their convictions.

But we are not yet through with treating upon the quotations sometimes referred to by the weak-backed who need a ramrod fastened parallel with their spinal column, and occasionally manifest a desire to see the stiffening taken out of others. A favorite passage used by such will be found on page 435 [D&C 124:49–50] of the same work from which we have already extracted. Here it is:

"Verily, verily I say unto you, That when I give a commandment to any of the sons of men, to do a work unto my name, and those sons of men go with all their might, and with all they have to perform that work, and cease not their diligence, and their enemies come upon them, and hinder them

from performing that work; behold, it behoveth me to require that work no more at the hands of those sons of men, but to accept of their offerings.

"And the iniquity and transgression of my holy laws and commandments, I will visit upon the heads of those who hindered my work, unto the third and fourth generation, so long as they repent not, and hate me, saith the Lord God.

["]Therefore for this cause have I accepted the offerings of those whom I commanded to build up a city and a house unto my name, in Jackson county, Missouri, and were hindered by their enemies, saith the Lord your God." [D&C 124:49–50]

It is a little singular that some people will persistently refuse to see the difference between *a certain special work* and **A PRINCIPLE OR LAW**. The consistency of the Lord relieving a people from any such obligation as the building of a house when prevented by enemies from accomplishing it is self-evident. When it comes to ***the abrogation of a law, a principle, a truth,*** **THE MATTER IS ENTIRELY DIFFERENT.** *The revelation does not apply* ***even remotely*** **TO THE PRESENT SITUATION.**

We will now take the Saints living in Idaho, to illustrate the extent to which the policy of abrogation under pressure would go, if applied after the fashion desired by some people we wot [sic] of. Our brethren of the north are oppressed umbearably, not only on account of the practice of plural marrriage, but for their belief in its rightfulness. According to the doctrine of the compromisers belief in the correctness of a principle would have to be given up. By what process this species of relinquishment could be attained does not, however, appear, the operation being to all intents, a mental impossibility. (*Deseret Evening News*, Vol. 18, Friday Evening, June 5, 1885)

Tuesday 5 Nov 1889

WHY
THE DESERET NEWS
SHOULD BE SUBSCRIBED TO
IN PREFERENCE TO ANY OTHER PAPER

1. It is the Organ of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and the authorized medium through which the views, wishes and instructions of the Church Authorities are expressed, and given to the Saints. . . . . (*Deseret Evening News* November 5, 1889)

[37]Nearly six years later on May 17th, 1888, President Woodruff made another statement in the Manti Temple, wherein he affirmed that: *"We are not going to stop the practice of plural marriage* ***until the coming of the Son of Man****."* (Diary of Apostle Heber J. Grant, May 17th, 1888, as cited in *Church, State, and Politics: The Diaries of John Henry Smith*, edited by Jean Bickmore White <1990> 200–201)

Apostle John Henry Smith was also present and has left us the following record of this occasion in his diary:

Thursday, May 17, 1888 — Manti

"The following brethren met to have prayers at 10 A.M. in the Temple: Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, F. D. Richards, George Q. Cannon, Brigham Young, F. M. Lyman, H. J. Grant, D. H. Wells, John Smith, Jacob Gates, S. B. Young, John Morgan, Kanute Peterson, W. H. Fulsom, Jon. Sharp, A. H. Lund, D. D. McArthur, W. S. Snow, E. L. Parry, R. Campbell, J. B. Maiben, Henry Beal, Jas. G. Bleak, C. Wilkin, J. D. T. McAllister, W. S. Farnsworth, George Reynolds, A. Winters.

"B. Young prayed and the following brethren met in the circle, Bro. George Q. Cannon being mouth: Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, F. D. Richards, G. Q. Cannon, B. Young, F. M. Lyman, H. J. Grant, D. H. Wells, Jacob Gates, S. B. Young, John Morgan, J. D. T. McAllister, D. D. McArther, J. G. Bleak, M. F. Farnsworth, Kanute Peterson, Henry Beal, J. B. Maiben, A. H. Lund, George Reynolds, C. H. Wilkin and myself.

"12 noon we met and after singing President Wilford Woodruff [gave] the Dedicatory Prayer. After which we shouted three times, Hosanna to God and the Lamb. Bro. Woodruff spoke a few words. Lorenzo Snow spoke. Bro. Geo. Q. Cannon talked very nicely, also B. Young.

"Bro. Woodruff spoke a few words again, among them he said ["]*We won't quit practicing Plural Marriage* ***until Christ shall come****."* F. M. Lyman spoke very nicely. President Woodruff dismissed us by prayer." (Church, State, and Politics: the Diaries of John Henry Smith, edited by Jean Bickmore White <1990> 200–201; For other sources on this see *Utah Historical Quarterly* 39: <Fall 1971> 359; The original manuscript is presently housed in Special Collections at the University of Utah Library)

A statement made by President George Q. Cannon, at Manti, Utah, on the 15th of February 1891.

It is self evident from this statement that President Cannon is endeavoring to prepare the minds of the Saints for what President Woodruff and other brethren would soon be Testifying to before the Master in Chancery — namely that the Manifesto meant that all Plural Marriages must end. Indeed according to what Woodruff would soon be Testifying to before the Government — not only did the Manifesto include in its scope the cessation of all Plural Marriages after the issuance of the 1890 Manifesto, but it also included the ending of all Plural Marriages that were entered into before the Manifesto was issued.

In other words President Woodruff, President Joseph F. Smith and President Lorenzo Snow soon would be required to testify before the Master in Chancery that the meaning of Woodruff's Manifesto was that the practice of Plural Marriage in the Church must terminate. In essence then, so far as this life is concern, Woodruff's 1890 Manifesto meant the separation from and divorce of all plural wives in this life time. In this statement, President Cannon carefully reveals to the Saints, that they must not rely on President Woodruff or any other man

I shall rely upon the Lord to suggest to my mind such things as will best meet the needs of the Saints present here TO-NIGHT . . . . . .

We have . . . tribulations, and ***they are different*** from those we had in former times. Once our persecutions came in the form of mobbings and driving, hunger and nakedness, and these things

tried the faith of many; of some so sorely that they turned away from the truth, fell into darkness, and left the Church which they once delighted in.

Our recent trials have been in the shape of imprisonments of our brethren, and confiscations of our property; and these things are hard to bear . . . .

I am aware that there is a disposition on the part of a few *to make comparisons between things past* ***and things present,*** TO THE DISADVANTAGE OF THINGS PRESENT; and to conclude that ***the Church is gone astray,*** that it has been allowed to drift without the guidance of the power of God. The MANIFESTO has been a stumbling block to some, and other things have tried the faith of the Latter-day Saints in varying degrees, but I think they should not.

I am rather pleased that we should have these things to contend with, because I realize that they are necessary in order that we may gain strength to stand, not alone, but by our own faith in the Lord and with His help. He seems determined to teach us to rely on Him and not on our own strength, nor on the strength and wisdom of man. If there ever was a time when the Saints stood in need of ***an individual, personal testimony*** of the truth of the Gospel which they have embraced, it surely is now, and they must have it or there is no security for them. . . . . .

Every individual has a right to a personal knowledge of the truth, and of *the mind and will of God* ***concerning his own personal affairs***. Our Father does not ask you to walk in darkness, *nor by another's light,* but it is His good pleasure to give EACH ONE OF YOU the light of His Holy Spirit in your own souls. By this light you have right to examine ***all things,*** that you may *hold fast to that which is good*. It is your privilege to know for yourselves, *not only if Joseph Smith was a true Prophet,* ***but whether Wilford Woodruff is God's own choice*** *of a leader* in His Church, if the Twelve Apostles are approved of Him, and ALL THINGS ***whatsoever*** *which concern you to know.*

I would not give much for a Latter-day Saint who does not know these things, because the want of this knowledge proves that individual slothful and lax . . . . . .

It is indeed our right and privilege to have the companionship of the Holy Spirit of the Lord, and we need it. Even children may

have it if they will, and need not be left to walk alone on earth. *Every woman should win and keep it for herself,* and ***never try to walk by another's light***. If she puts her whole trust in another, even if he be her husband and a good man, he will surely some time fail her. Let her learn to stand alone so far as human aid is concerned, ***depending only on God*** *and the Holy Ghost*.

Do not, brethren, ***put your trust in man*** *though he be a Bishop,* ***an Apostle,*** OR A PRESIDENT; *if you do,* ***they will fail*** *you at some time* or place; *they will do wrong* or seem to, and your support be gone; but if we lean on God, He never will fail us. When men and women depend on God alone, and trust in Him alone, their faith will not be shaken ***if the highest in the Church*** *should step aside*. . . .

Perhaps it is His own design that faults and weaknesses should appear ***in high places*** in order that His Saints may learn to trust in Him *and not in any man or men*. Therefore, my brethren and sisters, seek after the Holy Spirit and the unfailing testimony of God and His work upon the earth. (*Millennial Star* 53: <19 Oct 1891> **657–658,** < 26 Oct 1891> **473–474**)

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 165

12 [**Oct 1891**] I went to the Gardo & signed 59 Recommends. I received 30 Letters. I signed 15 Students Cirtificates. I met with the 12 upon the subject of our going before the Master in Chancery. We then Met with Dixon upon the same subject and He questioned us upon the subjects we would be questioned upon.

* * * * * *

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 165

17 [**Oct 1891**] I spent the day at the Gardo with F S Richards & the Twelve preparing for the Court on Monday. /Signed 63 Recommend 24 Letter./

* * * * * *

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 166

[p.166] For the first time in my life I was Called before the Master in chancery to testify upon the principal of Poligamy all of which was published in the Daily papers. President George Q Cannon testifyed upon the property of the Church.

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 166

Oct 20 [**1891**] G. Q. Cannon, J F Smith, L Snow & Anthon Lund went to Cort to Testify upon the Principal of Poligamy. I signed 52 Recommends. I received 14 Letters. I signed 4 Cirtificats. Wrote to Lucy Smith. G. Q. Cannon J. F. Smith L Snow A. H. Lund all testified before the Master in chauncery upon the subject of Poligamy & Church property.

* * * * *

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 166

22 [**Oct 1891**] I signed 34 Recommends. I received 18 Letters. We met with the Twelve & had Prayers. We met with quite a Number of parties.

* * * * * *

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 166

24 [**Oct 1891**] I spent the day in the Gard at home at work untill 3 oclok. Then took Cars with G. Q. Cannon & Blanch & rode to Brigham City to Attend a Conference. We arived at 6 oclok & stoped with my Daughter Phebe A. Snow. 16 m.[p.167]

[Click to view full-size image]

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 168

[p.168] **25** [**Oct 1891**] **Sunday** Met at 10 oclock. Prayer by Bishop D[ana?]. G. Q. Cannon spoke 50 Minuts. Rudger Clawson spoke 30 M. Afternoon. Prayer By Bishop C Jenson. Sacramet was Administerd And the Authorities of the Church was then presented & Accepted. W. Woodruff Then took the stand & spoke 40 Minuts. I made the following remarks:

¶ I wish to mak the following remarks upon the principal of Revelation. Some had thought that Revelation had sceased, But this is not the Case. The Lord is with us & gives us Revelation. But I will say for myself that I wish to Avoid saying Thus Saith the Lord as far as I Can when I give the will of the Lord to the people. In the Days of Joseph Smith it was Thus saith the Lord almost Daily untill the Revelations now embodied in the Book of Doctrins & Covenants had Been given. Since that day President Brigham Young John Taylor & myself have seldom used the words (Thus saith the Lord) when giving the word of the Lord to the people.

¶ In the 68 Sec of the Book of D & C we are informed that when men speak as they are moved upon by the Holy Ghost it is [the] word of the Lord & Revelation. I have Received a Revelation and a Commandment from the Lord which I have not revealed to any man which I shall reveal to this assembly and the Command of the Lord I shall give to this people which is this. The Lord has revealed to me that there are many in the Church who feel badly tried about the Manifesto and also about the Testimony of the Presidency and Apostls before the Master in Chancery. The Lord has Commanded me to put the following question to the Saints and those who will give Attention to it shall have the Holy Ghost to be with them to inspire them to Answer that question for themselves and the Lord has promised that the Answer will be to all alike. The question is this. Which is the wisest course for the latter Day Saints to persue, to Continue to attempt to practice plural Marriage with the Laws of the Nation against it and the opposition of 60,000,000 of People and at the Cost of Confiscation and loss of all the Temples and the stoping of all the ordinances therein both for the living & the Dead And the imprisinment of the First Presidency and Twelve and [p.169][p.170] the leaders or heads of family in the Church And the Confiscation of the personal property of the People (All of which of themselve would stop the Practice? [In other words God is powerless to keep His Promises or to Protect the Saints if they should faithfully live the Gospel.] Finished on Nov 5th.

[Click to view full-size image]

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 170

26 At 3 oclok I went to the Cars and left at 3.30 for Salt Lake. Arived at Salt Lake at 8 oclok. 60 Mile.

* * * * * *

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 170

Oct 28 1891 I signed 40 Recommends. I received 18 Letters. We met with the Board of the Bank. I got a stream of water of about 6 gallons a minute in my last Well 2 inch pipe [ ] feet in the ground & the plunge rod [ ] feet below the pipe. I attended The Jewish Charity Ball in the Theater.

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 170

29 I signed 3 Recommends. I received 2 Letters. I met with the Twelve & had Prayers.

* * * * * *

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 170

31 I spent the forenoon at home. Took Cars at 3.30 & rode to Logan & spent the night with Moses Thatcher. 10 mils.

November

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 170

Nov 1, Sunday We Met in the Tabernacle at 10 oclk to Attend the Quarterly Conference. Singing & Prayer By Wm. B. Preston. J F Smith spoke 62 Minuts. G Q Cannon spoke 35 M. Went to M Thatcher for Noon. G Q Cannon & J F Smith ordaind Henry Yates to second Councillor to Bishop Jardine. Afternoon. W Woodruff Offered the Dedicatory Prayer & Dedicated the Meeting Hous. WW. spoke 53 Minutes. GQC spoke 34. We held an Evening Meeting. Joseph F Smith spoke 32 M. WW spoke 31 M, GQC 20 M.

Wilford Woodruff's Journal, Vol. 9, p. 171

THE JOURNAL OF APOSTLE ABRAHAM H. CANNON
VOL 15

Thursday, Nov'r. 12th, 1891.

Salt Lake City. } Unsettled weather. — During the forenoon I was busily engaged at my usual work in the office. At 2 p.m. I attended my Council meeting where were present all the [First] Presidency, F. D. Richards, F. M. Lyman, John H. Smith, H. J. Grant, Jno. W. Taylor and myself; Geo. Gibbs, Clerk. Bro. Richards was mouth in prayer, after which appointments for Quarterly Conferences were made.

[¶] The matter of the Manifesto and the extent of its meaning was then discussed. Pres. Woodruff said that he was placed in such a position on the witness stand [before the Master in Chancery] that he could not answer other than he did; yet any man who deserts and neglects his wives or children because of the Manifesto, should be handled on his fellowship. Our talk resolved itself into this[,] that men must be careful to avoid exposing themselves to arrest or conviction for violations of the law, and yet they must not break their covenants with their wives. —

The Presidency have decided to vacate the Gardo House, inasmuch as it appears as though the government was determined to hold on to it, and they will occupy the offices on the opposite side of the street. This will save considerable to the Church, as the rent of the Gardo House alone amounts to several hundred dollars per month. ——

In the evening I went to the farm and had supper, after which I took Mina to town and she and Mary went to the theatre together,

and I went alone. The comic opera "Sinbad" was presented. It has some very pleasing and catchy music, and was quite interesting. The play did not end till about midnight, but at its close I took Mina and M. E. C. to the farm, the latter going to Aunt Martha's. It was 1 a.m. before I got to bed. (Journal of Abraham H. Cannon, Vol. 15: <12 Nov 1891> 121–122)

THE JOURNAL OF APOSTLE ABRAHAM H. CANNON:

VOL 16: <THURSDAY, 1 APRIL 1892> 80

Friday, April 1, 1892: At 2 o'clock I was at the meeting of my quorum in the upper room of the Historian's Office, where, after waiting about three-quarters of an hour, we got seven of the brethren together. They were, Pres. L. Snow, F. D. Richards, Moses Thatcher, F. M. Lyman, H. J. Grant, John W. Taylor and myself. After prayer by Moses Thatcher Pres. **Snow arose and expressed his dissatisfaction at our lack of promptness in attending these meetings, and our neglect of them. He felt that we should always be on time, and never allow anything to interfere with our being present at the times appointed. He then continued: "As for myself I would like to get rid of all financial matters and devote myself to the spiritual affairs of the work. This might not do for my brethren, but I believe we will yet have to take positions which we do not now understand. When the Manifesto was issued we had no idea that it was to effect our cohabitation with our wives, but Pres. Woodruff and his brethren [i.e. George Q. Cannon, Joseph F. Smith, Lorenzo Snow] who were on the witness stand before the Master in Chancery, were forced to go further in their testimony than we anticipated, or we would have been placed in a worse position than we were before the Manifesto was issued.** — It is the privilege of you brethren to see the Savior, and thus testify of Him, and that you know He lives."

—

Heber J. Grant said: "I remember Pres. Woodruff saying that the Manifesto would never apply to our living with our wives, and he would see them damned and in hell before he would agree to cease living with his wives or advise any other

person to do so. Still we have been led to our present position by degrees, and I believe it is all right. —

I would like to be relieved of financial matters if it were possible and in accord with the minds of my brethren, and go upon a mission so that I can get those great spiritual blessings of which the brethren speak but which I have never enjoyed. I find that dissensions are growing to some extent among my brethren engaged with me in business, and this I do not want. I have tried to do my daily duties to the best of my ability, but wish I could now have a relief in this way. (p. 81) **Concerning the living with our wives, I believe that if we had taken the manly stand and had said we will continue to live with and honor our present wives but will cease marrying in the future, we would have fared better; but now I cannot see any chance of our ever being permitted to live with our wives in freedom again." ——**

Moses Thatcher: "I have yet to meet the first man among all the eminent men with whom I have conversed upon our question[,] who feels that our past family relations should be disrupted. They did not want this, and therefore I must believe that the Lord had some other object in permitting us to make the promises we have concerning the relations with our wives. I think it is the duty of every Latter-day Saint to place himself in such a position that he will not bring reproach upon the Church for any of his actions, and we should especially do nothing with our wives that would give the lie to the testimony of the brethren in the Court." He then spoke of the union of Church and State, and protested against our interferance in political matters. "The king of England once deeded the whole of the British Isles to the Pope of Rome, and the latter then leased it to the King for the yearly payment of 1000 Marks. This sum was paid annually for 150 years, and it cost much bloodshed and trouble to separate the Church and State. **Now we have got to keep out of politics as a Church, or we will bring irretrievable trouble upon ourselves." He told of the union that once existed in Cache valley; so great was it that Pres. Woodruff did not know but that some branches of the United Order could be there established. Now, however, politics have so divided the people that one can scarcely tell Saints from sinners, and we are calling each other all the vile names we can**

think of. What the result will be he could not say."

At this point Pres. Jos. F. Smith entered with a dispatch from Judge Williams of Washington saying that If an urgent dispatch were sent tonight to Pres. [Benjamin] Harrison, he did not know but that the Amnesty petition would be signed in time to present to the approaching conference. The following was therefore presented: "Could Amnesty come before our Conference, we believe the boon would be profoundly appreciated by our people."

All of us excepting Moses Thatcher and Jno W. Taylor authorized our names to be attached to the telegram. Another dispatch will be sent signed by prominent outsiders in this city. Moses said he believed it was for political effect that this was proposed at this time, and he did not propose to be led into any such trap. We all felt that this was probably the object, but were still willing that it should occur. John W. did not want to sign it or anything else without having time to consider it. Pres. Smith then started with the message to President Woodruff's house to obtain his signature to it. We continued our meeting.

[¶] Pres. Snow said he felt that when any question came up among us on which the majority were clear, should there be one who did not see as the others, that one should be willing to yield his views to those of the majority, and leave the responsibility of the course pursued with them.

John W. Taylor spoke in relation to the Manifesto: "I do not know that that thing was right, though I voted to sustain it, and will assist to maintain it; but among my father's papers I found a revelation given him of the Lord, and which is now in my possession, in which the Lord told him that the principle of plural marriage would never be overcome. Pres. Taylor desired to have it suspended, but the Lord would not permit it to be done.["]

At the close of John W's remarks our quorum meeting adjourned till tomorrow at 10 o'clock. (Journal of Abraham H. Cannon)

Saturday, April 2, 1892: At 10 o'clock our quorum met, and in addition to those present yester- (p. 83) day we had John H. Smith

and Anthon H. Lund. Prayer by F. D. Richards. **Pres. Snow spoke of cohabitation and said though our sisters were in great trouble [of mind, still] they were not enduring worse things now than the female Saints had endured in the past. They should be willing to put up with inconveniences and troubles in order that the Church and the brethren may not be brought into trouble.**

———

F. D. Richards said: "I met and talked with Pres. [George Q.] Cannon just before coming to this meeting and he told me that it was only a question of a short time before we would have amnesty, as Pres. Harrison had decided to issue the proclamation, but was only considering the terms and phraseology of the same. He has a desire to make it as broad as possible. The feeling in the east towards us is very kind. Pres. Cannon succeeded in getting his bonds released, which is quite an important thing for him. Concerning cohabitation I think we should use the utmost care. We should refrain from living with our wives untill a better feeling is created towards us, and then we will be permitted to give them our attentions as we formerly did. Amensty will only apply to past offences, and will not relieve us of future misdemeanors." ——

I then arose and explained the position I occupied and my manner of living. I wanted the brethren to counsel me if I was doing wrong, but hoped they would not tell me not to live with my families. — It was a marvel to my brethren, as it is to me, how I have escaped arrest and conviction, but it is only through the blessing of the Lord that I have been thus preserved. —— The brethren had not any censure for me, but felt that we should all be very careful so as not to bring trouble upon the Church by our actions. All of the brethren spoke upon this subject with the result that it was left for each person to do what he felt to be right, and as the Lord might inspire.

John Henry felt that all should take their plural families over the line. As a parting com[ent] Pres. Snow told us to keep our own affairs to ourselves in such matters. We now adjourned subject to call, Bro. Lund dismissing with prayer. —— * * * * * * (Journal of Abraham H. Cannon)

Sunday, April 3, 1892: At 10 o'clock our general Conference convened in the large Tabernacle. There was a very large attendance

of officers and members, and a very good spirit prevailed. . . . .

In the afternoon the large congregation in the Tabernacle was addressed by Jos. F. Smith for about an hour. He spoke of the punishment which will be meted out to the wicked who receive not the testimony of the Elders, but said that the Saints who turned away from the truth when once they had received it would receive a far greater punishment for their sins. He referred to our professions which do not always correspond with our acts, for we do things of which Saints should be ashamed. We must keep all the commandments of God if we expect to receive the highest exaltation. He read from the Doctrine and Covenants to show that we must be willing to sacrifice everything for the work of the Lord. . . . . (Journal of Abraham H. Cannon)

List of edditions:

1888 statement of WW in the Manti Temple — other statement. JT statement 13 Oct 1882.

GQC Statement discrediting WW, saying that you should not trust anyone.

WW, JSF, LS statements before the master in chancery.

The Trial of Apostle Matthias F. Cowley

Minutes of a meeting of the Council of the Twelve held May 10, 1911, at 10:30 A.M. in the Salt Lake Temple, at which there were present: President Francis M. Lyman, Heber J. Grant, Hyrum M. Smith, George Albert Smith, Charles W. Penrose, George F. Richards, Orson F. Whitney, David O. McKay, Anthony W. Ivins and Joseph F. Smith Jr., of the Council and Matthias F. Cowley in response to the following summons.—

Salt Lake City, Utah, April 27, 1911.
Elder Matthias F. Cowley,
123 North, West Temple St., City.

My Dear Brother:

By this writing you are summoned to appear before the Council of the Twelve Apostles in the Salt Lake Temple at 10 A.M. on Wednesday, May 10th, to answer complaints against you of marrying plural wives yourself and of giving plural wives to others. Also of advising and encouraging other men to enter into plural marriages illegally and against the established discipline of the Church, and to show cause why you should not be adjudged guilty.

You will be required to answer all questions that will be asked you by the Council along the above lines, telling the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Do not fail to appear as we shall be there to receive you.

Affectionately,
Your Brother,

Francis M. Lyman,
In behalf of the Council.

The meeting commenced by singing, "This Earth was Once a Garden Place," p. 277. Prayer by Elder Heber J. Grant. Singing: "Come O Thou King of Kings," p. 209.

President Lyman: The brethren will remember that we have been for quite a long time trying to discover Brother Cowley. We have taken pains to put letters into his wife's hands, we have registered them to him at Baker City, Oregon, and to Boise, Idaho, and around the country and have been unsuccessful until a short time ago when we learned he was in this neighborhood and would come and see me. I talked a little with Brother Cowley when I served the summons on him about ten days ago and he disclaimed any intention of trying to keep away from us although circumstances have led us to believe that he has. I believe his case is the most remarkable that has come before us in as much as he has been with us once or twice before and he has expressed his respect for us, but we have felt that we have not been properly treated by him. We have met some things in our travels that have disposed us to believe that he was working against us and giving encouragement to those who

are in this position. I am simply making these statements Brother Cowley, to give you an understanding so that you can clear yourself. We have been under the impression that Brother Cowley has been at the forefront and has been under the cause of more people entering into this condition of plural marriage than any one else and no man did more toward getting Presidents of Stakes and Presidents of Missions to enter polygamous marriages, which he should not have done and we want him to come here and tell his story, as we tell him in the letter and tell all he knows and clear himself. He has been very well informed as to the position of the Church on this question from the time of President Woodruff. We have always had advice and could always get it from those who would have advised him aright. From the time of his ordination into the Apostleship I believe I was entitled to his confidence and that he should have approached me in preference to any other man because I took him a little under my wing and we were quite confidential with each other, but since he has taken his stand contrary to the Church he has not advised with me as he should have done because he knew of my views on the question. The report is that he said you should not talk with Brother Lyman or with Brother Joseph F. Smith, as I was opposed to and President Smith did not want to know anything about it. I am convinced that in Canada and Mexico, in Idaho and Wyoming and all over he has been effecting plural marriages among the people and has done a great deal of harm in this respect. We would like Brother Cowley to stand up here and begin at the beginning and tell us of every case that he has been connected with and if he had authority where he got the authority and tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and after he has got through we will be prepared to ask him a few questions. We would not like him to involve any one or place the responsibility upon some one else when he should shoulder it. We do not want him to put the responsibility upon the Church, as we stand here to defend the Church in President Snow's and subsequently President Smith's administration. We feel that Brother Cowley is more responsible for the condition in the Church than any other man in the Church and we do not want him to place the responsibility upon any dead

man unless he can prove it and we want him to open his heart and be candid with us and tell everything. Brother Lyman read the summons appearing at the beginning of these minutes and also a copy of a letter which he sent Brother John W. Taylor and he was under the impression to Brother Cowley also. He had sent one to Brother Grant who acknowledged receiving it and he thought also to Brother Teasdale. Brother Cowley said he did not remember receiving the letter although he received the word from Brother Teasdale. The letter follows:

Salt Lake City, Utah, May 5th, 1904.
Elder John W. Taylor,
Colonial Juarez.

Dear Brother:

Acting under the advise and counsel of the First Presidency I take this means of calling your attention to the official declaration on the subject of plural marriages adopted by the late General Conference of the Church; and I bespeak your hearty cooperation in emphasizing the same in your private conversations and counsels as well as your public utterances, to the end that no misunderstanding may exist among our people concerning its scope and meaning; but on the contrary, that all may be given to distinctly understand that infractions of the law in regard to plural marriage are transgressions against the Church, punishable by excommunication.

That God may bless you in all your ministry is the prayer of

Your affectionate brother,
Francis M. Lyman.

From that time I feel the brethren have been thoroughly advised. Brothers Taylor, Cowley and Woodruff were with the Council when President Snow was selected as President of the Church and the question of plural marriages came up. Brother Lyman related the circumstances surrounding the (sic) of the First Presidency at that time. President Snow stating that they (Plural marriages) would stop and later in January issued his declaration on this subject which appeared in the Deseret News of January 8th following his selection as President. President Lyman read this statement as also that of President Smith. Now we would like to hear from Brother Cowley concerning where he has done wrong from the first offense, where

he got his authority, whether by word of mouth or written authority what his thoughts have been, who have been in his confidence and who his advisers have been. I think he has more to tell on this subject than any other man living in the Church today.

Matthias F. Cowley: I will say, Brethren, in the outset in regard to appearing before you that it was purely an accident that I did not get the word. I moved from Boise on my way to Spokane and left word to have my mail forwarded and when I got to Union, Oregon, I got word not to go to Spokane, I did not have an address, but went to the Post Office for my mail. You have had a wrong understanding of this, as I have had no intention of trying to avoid you, but I would rather not discuss these things. I have been accused of many things which I have not done, but I do not know how I can prove my innocence. The first case of plural marriage I was connected with, as I remember, was Brother Kelsch. He returned from his mission in 1898, and was sent to me by President Cannon and all the authority I exercised on that occasion came from President George Q. Cannon. President Cannon told me he had the authority from President Woodruff and Brother Joseph F. Smith told me on two occasions that Brother Cannon had the authority and Brother Woodruff didn't want to be known in it. Brother Ben E. Rich came to me. Brother William W. Burton, a relative of President Joseph F. Smith, came to me from him. As to Mission Presidents, Brothers Rich, Robinson and Duffin are the only ones I have married. I have had nothing to do with these marriages since the resignation of Brother Taylor and myself, I have had nothing to do with any of these. Brother Alpha Higgs came to me and I told him I could not do it and as I understood things now would have nothing more to do with it. I have had two conversations with President Smith, one a few evenings ago and he said if you are free of these later offenses that is all we want to know, but we feel hard toward the man who has induced the people to go in since the declaration of the Presidency. The reason I didn't consult President Lyman was because it was given me to understand that I should consult no one. I was told to keep my own counsel and was severely censured one time by Brother Cannon for consulting someone else regarding a

certain marriage. Brother Penrose told me once in the city of Mexico, that he had written the manifesto, and it was gotten up so that it did not mean anything and President Smith had told me the same. I mention these things only to show the training I have had from those over me. I have been conscientious in these things; when I got the dispensation from President Cannon, Ben E. Rich came to me and had two women and I told him I only had the dispensation for him and Laura and he eventually accepted my word. I didn't try to get people to go into it. I married Apostle Brigham Young and Brother Merrill. I couldn't induce these men to take plural wives if they were not already converted. The people came to me understanding I had the authority. I married Brother Young about 1902, I cannot remember the exact dates. I was never instructed to go to a foreign land to perform these marriages, although in some cases I did so. If you can give me some specific case I can better tell and you can decide whether I have been guilty. I have been lied about as others have.

Question: It is claimed that you told Sister Dusenberry that it is probable that plural marriages could be performed.

M. F. Cowley: I saw her and Brother Jex in Provo one day talking very nicely together, I said you look like two lovers about ready to get married. It was said simply in a jocular sense, possibly unwisely. President Snow told me at one time when I went to consult him about marrying Joseph Morrell of Cache county, that he would not interfere with the unfinished business of President Woodruff. I do not feel that it is right to put all these responsibilities on me, but if it were before the world I would be willing to bear them. I married Frank Y. Taylor, John M. Cannon and others who are held in high esteem here. They were all before 1904, I think about 1901 or 1902. The first I performed was Ben E. Rich and the last David Udall, the last taking place in Idaho. I married most of them in the United States. Brother Merrill was married, I think in 1903, to Hulda Erickson. I am not dishonest and not a liar and have always been true to the work and to the brethren. I have always been true and faithful myself. We have always been taught that when the brethren were in a tight place that it would not be amiss

to lie to help them out. One of the Presidency of the Church made the statement some years ago when I was in the presidency of one of the stakes of Zion in Idaho that he would lie like hell to help his brethren. What I have done has been done conscientiously and under the direction of those higher up not defiantly or with the idea of taking the bits in my own mouth. I doubt if you can bring one man who can honestly claim that I have got him to enter a plural marriage. If I have erred through these influences I ask to be forgiven. I feel that I have been punished once for these offenses and that I should not be punished again. I have done nothing since 1906 nor taken a plural wife myself. I married my last wife in Canada in the summer of 1905, Sister Harker in 1899.

President Lyman: Who married you?

M. F. Cowley: Brother Merrill put me under a solemn covenant binding me not to tell, I was married in the Logan Temple so leave you to guess the rest.

President Lyman: Whose advise did you seek?

M. F. Cowley: President Cannon told me to do these things or I would never have done it. President Snow, did not, he simply told me that he would not interfere with Brother Woodruff's and Cannon's work. I married Sister Harker and Mary L. Taylor, Brother J. A. Wolff married me to Sister Taylor. I heard two of the brethren in Mexico and two in Canada had authority to perform plural marriages and that it came from President George Q. Cannon. I believe no authority has been exercised, except in the Tolman case, which I know nothing about, but what came from President Cannon. I understand that President Isaac Smith had his marriage performed in Canada and Brother _____ of Rexburg went to Mexico. I never directed any one to go to Brother Wolff.

Question: Did Brother Taylor give Brother Wolff any authority?

M. F. Cowley: I don't know. All I know, I think a Brother Levitt went to President Smith and asked him if it would be alright and he referred him to Brother Taylor who had charge of all things in Canada.

G. F. Richards: Was it known at the time you were dropped

from the Council of the Twelve by the Council that you had taken these two wives?

M. F. Cowley: These facts were understood although the dates were not given. President Smith assured me that I should not be molested if I have not been guilty. I performed the ceremony for Brother Woodruff at Preston, Idaho, and Sister Clark about 1903, I think. I married John M. Cannon and Frank Y. Taylor to two each, long before 1904, both on the same day. Byron Sessions in the Big Horn in 1902. I did not marry Brother Bassed of Rexburg He came to me and asked if I could help him out and I told him no.

H. M. Smith: When did you feel your authority ceased that Brother Cannon conferred upon you?

M. F. Cowley: I felt that the authority I received continued only that I didn't exercise it without getting all the support I could. The most of them went to Brother Cannon and then came to me.

Question: After Brother Snow and Brother Cannon were dead did you still exercise the authority?

M. F. Cowley: I don't think I have.

H. J. Grant related a conversation he had with Brother Cowley after he came home from Japan, when Brother Cowley came to him and said if he could get a wife he, Cowley, would go with him to Canada or Mexico and help him out.

This conversation was denied by Brother Cowley.

Brother Grant stated further that he went to President Smith and asked him if it was possible for him to get another wife and President Smith told him it was not. Brother Grant being desirous of marrying Fanny Woolley, and Brother Cowley told him: "if you want her I will help you."

D. O. McKay: Did any one else know you married Brother Sessions?

M. F. Cowley: I think Brother Woodruff was the only one. I have had the idea that President Smith was not opposed to these marriages if it could be done without trouble with the government.

H. J. Grant: Several Elders came to the British Mission while I was presiding there and told me that after they had been instructed

in the Temple that these things had stopped, Brother Cowley had come out and told them that if they wanted another wife when they came back they could get one.

This Brother Cowley denied.

M. F. Cowley: I married Brother Taylor twice, but not the last time, that is new to me. I don't know anything about the Sandberg girl. I married Brother Chamberlain here in Salt Lake. He was in touch with Brother Cannon. Also Brother Robinson, who was in touch with Brother Cannon.

A. W. Ivins: Was it talked among the people that they could not talk to Brother Lyman and John Henry Smith about these things, and also thought permissible to date these things back before the manifesto?

M. F. Cowley: I believed it was. Brother Merrill led me to believe that President Smith's declaration was not meant for foreign countries and with that understanding I took my last plural wife.

President Lyman: How did you come to marry Brother Thomas Chamberlain?

M. F. Cowley: As I remember it, he came to me and said he had seen President Cannon. I did not marry Israel Barlow. Brother Cowley related the Circumstances connected with the marrying of his last wife, being engaged in Mexico and later marrying her in Canada, after she had become infatuated with another man and fallen out with him. I married Henry S. Tanner to one of the Richards girls and one of the Thatcher girls but don't know anything about any other marriages.

A. W. Ivins: Did you have the Idea in your mind that it would be alright to date your marriage back prior to the date and to misrepresent the facts?

M. F. Cowley: The influence of Brother Merrill and his position and his having received the authority from President Cannon had a good effect upon me.

Question: Had it ever been discussed or thought that John W. Taylor would ever become President of the Church and it was the proper thing to get into line and stand in defense of the principle of plural marriage?

M. F. Cowley: I have heard the idea that some time John W. Taylor would preside over the Church, but not in connection with plural marriage. I never entertained any idea of superiority upon the theory of plural marriage on account of those in the position. I believed President Woodruff married a wife the year before he died, of course I don't know, I can't prove it. I married John W. Taylor in Farmington at his home. I have refused to marry Charles H. Hyde, George Porter, Lula Johnson and a girl who wanted to marry George Goddard. I didn't encourage Charles Woolfenden and Dr. McGregor. They both spoke to me and I told them that there was no possible way. Woolfenden knew Tolman and he talked to me about it and I told him I did not think Tolman had any authority. I married J. M. Tanner to Mrs. Evans, George C. Parkinson to Fanny Woolley in Colorado. I married Brother Arthur Hart, but not Dr. Cutler or William C. Parkinson. I don't know any one who has been performing these marriages except Tolman and I don't know where he got the authority. I did not marry Clayson.

Question: Have you ever authorized any one at any time to marry anyone else?

M. F. Cowley: No sir, I don't think I had the right to.

C. W. Penrose: What do you think of the revelation to President Taylor in 1886?

M. F. Cowley: This would not justify me. He referred to a revelation to President Woodruff, which he took to President Smith and read it to him and he said if it had not been for President Woodruff's strength in that principle we would have had worse than the manifesto, and explained what certain diplomatic brethren thought was best to do. In view of this revelation thought the brethren really felt that they were not justified in stopping it and that is all the effect it had on my mind and the Taylor revelation had very little effect. I thought I should receive my instructions from the living oracles. I claimed to have been in harmony with you brethren since I was dropped from the quorum. I had nothing to do with the Roberts case, of Wasatch, and Joseph W. Musser, except ten or twelve years ago, I married a Hill girl to him. Married John W. Wolff ten or twelve years ago.

President Lyman: Did you marry my brother?

M. F. Cowley: He talked with me, but I had nothing to do with it. I possibly told him he could go to Mexico or Canada. I am willing to do anything I can to be in harmony with you, if I have done wrong. I ask your forgiveness. I am willing to do anything to set matters right. I want you to treat me as considerately as possible. I feel that I have erred in view of the sentiments and feelings of the brethren. I feel that the Lord has greatly blessed me in spirit and in regard to my personal standing before Him, and when you brethren have ruled I propose to stand by it in the future. I have never made a practice of performing marriages and encouraging them.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 and reconvened at 3:30 P.M.

H. M. Smith: Did you place any of these brethren under covenant not to divulge anything regarding their marriages or place them under oath?

M. F. Cowley: No, not under covenant or under oath, but I told them to be cautious and not get the Church into trouble. I was put under oath myself. The conditions were different then than now. I never performed a ceremony except in all solemnity. We always had prayer first and everybody knew who I was and I knew who I was marrying. No one was in disguise. I was asked to hold up my hands and solemnly swear, but I never did anything of that kind with the people I married.

President Lyman: You didn't consult me regarding these marriages.

M. F. Cowley: I understood that I was not to consult you or John Henry Smith, that you didn't want to know anything about these things.

President Lyman: Do you think you are justified in lying to help your brethren?

M. F. Cowley: I don't feel that a brother would be justified in screening another brother in doing that which is wrong, but in protecting him in doing that which is right.

President Lyman: I do not know how far I would be justified in lying or in [not] telling the truth to protect a brother in doing

what is right to protect him. (sic) As far as I feel, I don't think it has been required since President Woodruff's time that a man enter into plural marriage and those who have entered into it have done so upon their own responsibility.

G. F. Richards: Has Brother Tanner ever asked you to marry him more than twice?

M. F. Cowley: No sir.

President Lyman: Where you married people have you had recommends from their Bishops or presidents of stakes?

M. F. Cowley: No sir, they usually came with word from President Cannon.

Question: Did you marry Peter Anderson? Or Patriarch Tolman?

M. F. Cowley: No sir. I married Alonzo Merrill, but not, Fred, who I understand committed adultery. I married Hugh J. Cannon about 1903, I think. After President Cannon died I performed marriages for people who had been promised before that time. I married Heber Bennion and Brother Smart in Salt Lake City, also Jesse N. Smith.

The Sears matter was referred to and Brother Cowley said he had not married him although Brother Sears told him President Smith was vexed when he heard that he had not been married and he was married as late as 1906. There were instances where Brother Merrill sent men to me with the understanding on my part that they came from President Cannon.

C. W. Penrose: I understand that Brother Cowley advised Brother Bastian?

M. F. Cowley: I don't remember talking with him. I had the understanding when I married any one that they had been promised by some one in authority higher up. I also married Reuben G. Miller, Josiah Hickman, Abraham O. Woodruff, M. M. Steele, Jr. and George M. Cannon.

It was moved that Brother Cowley be excused, in parting he said: I want you brethren in considering my case to prove John W. Taylor a false prophet when he said that I would be excommunicated from the Church. If there is anything I can do to make good our honor

to the nation and to the saints I am willing to do it. I want you to know that I am not rebellious and never have been and if I have erred it has been because of these circumstances and the example of my brethren. I am in harmony with you and I would like you to put me upon my honor to make that good in the future. I would rather die than be cut off from the Church.

After the departure of Brother Cowley the Brethren of the Council each in turn expressed his views in relation to the case of Brother Cowley, the brethren remaining in session for some time. The matter was continued until Thursday, May 11th.

At a meeting of the Council of the Twelve Apostles held in the Temple, Thursday afternoon, May 11th, 1911, the following action was taken: —

This day by unanimous vote of the Council of the Twelve Apostles it was decided that Matthias F. Cowley, for insubordination to the government and discipline of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, be and he is hereby deprived of the right and authority to exercise any of the functions of the Priesthood.

Francis M. Lyman,
In behalf of the Council.